



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A

872,546

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

85113

VOL. XIV. NEW SERIES.

66

JANUARY—APRIL,

MDCCCLXX.

LONDON:
BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17 PORTMAN STREET,
AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.
DERBY: RICHARDSON & SONS.
DUBLIN: JAMES DUFFY; W. B. KELLY.
1870.

4P

4

.D82

CONTENTS.

ART. I.—THE THEORY OF DENOMINATIONAL EDUCATION.—PROSPECTS OF LEGISLATION ON POOR SCHOOLS.

The meaning of Catholic education	1
Catholic popular education	4
Catholic higher education	7
Denominational education	12
Absence of Catholics from the Education Commission	13
Its reports nevertheless most favourable to the Catholic view.	15
No plan so cheap as an extension of the present system.	17
Popular education has made most rapid progress under the present system	21
The report is decisive against compulsory education	25

ART. II.—ROME.

Jerusalem and Rome the two cities of God	28
Reprobation of Jerusalem	29
God's presence in Rome	32
Charms of Rome in the natural order	33
Rome the witness to Christ's Kingdom on earth	35
Contrast with modern society	37
Its education of youth	38
Its devotion to the Blessed Sacrament	41
The institutions of Rome	45
Vatican Council	56

ART. III.—THE ENGLISH PROTESTANT MARRIAGE LAW.

Recent Bill permitting marriage with deceased wife's sister	56
The Reformation overthrew the previously recognized standard of morality	57
At first it substituted the authority of the Old Testament	58
But soon transferred this prerogative to the civil government	60

ART. IV.—MR. RENOUF'S REPLY ON POPE HONORIUS.

Character of Mr. Renouf's reply	372
The Monothelite doctrine	373
Simple Duothelism of Honorius's Letters	377
The character of Sergius's letter	381
Violent historical improbability of Mr. Renouf's theory	382
Instances in which earlier Popes taught ex cathedrâ	384
No Pope ever taught ex cathedrâ that Honorius's Letters are heretical	387
The true nature of Honorius's offence	ib.
S. Leo II. confirmed ex cathedrâ the Definition of the Sixth Council, but not its Acts	392
He anathematized his predecessor, not for heresy, but for neglect	393
The Eastern bishops more probably intended to condemn Honorius's Letters as heretical	399
They most indubitably were not issued ex cathedrâ	400
There is nothing in the case of Honorius which disparages the infalli- bility of Rome's doctrinal guidance	403
Remarks on Mr. Renouf	405

ART. V.—DR. MOLLOY ON GEOLOGY AND REVELATION.

General purpose of this work	403
The earth's crust	405
Revolutions caused by water	406
And by subterranean fire	411
Interpretation of the Mosaic Record	414

ART. VI.—MR. TENNYSON'S ARTHURIAN POEMS.

Mr. Tennyson's great fame as a Poet	418
Difficulties of his present subject	419
The Coming of Arthur	420
Types of Female Character	422
The Holy Grail	424
The Passing of Arthur	428

ART. VII.—THE MINISTERIAL EDUCATION BILL.

Comparison of A.D. 1870 with A.D. 1820	430
Provisions of the new Bill	431
It is not what Catholics would have preferred	433
But none based on essentially better principles could have been carried	438
Amendments to be pressed	442
The plan pursued in Canada would have been most suitable for England	447

ART. VIII.—IS IRELAND IRRECONCILABLE ?

State of Ireland during the last autumn and winter	451
Difficulty of ascertaining true state of Irish public opinion	454
Conduct of Liberal Party towards Ireland	456
Recent Irish administrations	459
Mr. Gladstone's first appearance in Irish affairs	462
Commencement of agitation last autumn	463
The Fenians and Tenant-right	465
Attitude of Irish Tories and of the Parliamentary Liberals	466
Mr. Gladstone's scheme of governing Ireland	467
Its true sense	468
The Coercion Act and the National Press	470
The present Irish Administration	476
The Government Land Bill	477
The Education Question	479
Irish prospects and problems	480

ART. IX.—CONTROVERSIES ON THE COUNCIL.

Attitude of Protestant journals towards the Council	481
The dogma of Pontifical infallibility is already "de fide certum"	486
The Pope could by his own authority impose on all Catholics the obligation of believing it	488
Catholic writers have done much service in petitioning the Council for its definition	493
Conclusion	496

X.—ROMAN DOCUMENTS.

Pius IX.'s Letter to F. Ramière	497
Two proposals for a definition of the Pope's infallibility	498
Dr. Dollinger's criticism on the former	504
Reply of the "Civiltà" to Dr. Dollinger	509
Pius IX.'s Letter to Dom Guéranger	521

XI.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

F. Knox on the Church's Infallibility	523
P. Ramière's Contradictions of Mgr. Maret	527
P. Gratry's First Letter to Mgr. Dechamps	530
P. Gratry's Second and Third Letter	534
P. Ramière's Roman Doctrine on Liberalism	535
The Trinity College Declaration	535

Mr. Cobb's Separation not Schism	259
Mr. Rhodes on the Visible Unity of the Church	259
F. Christie's Lectures on Union with Rome	260
Galway Academical Papers	262
Mr. Garside's Discourses on the Parables	263
Patriarch Pelagius on the English Communion Service	265
Mr. Pye's Religion of Common Sense	267
F. Emidius's Manual of the Third Order of S. Francis	271
Mr. Healy Thompson's Translation of Boudon on Devotion to the Holy Angels	273
F. Wilberforce on Dominican Missions in Japan	277
Translations of FF. Weld and Coleridge	279
F. Broeckaert's Life of B. Charles Spinola	281
Mrs. Craven's Adelaide Capece Minutolo	282
M. Passe's Cantorbéry	285
Madame Swetchine's Writings	286
S. Charles and his Fellow-Labourers	287
New School History of England	289
The Catholic Directory	291
Catholic Music	291
Mr. Doyle's Fairy Land	295
The Month	296
The Carlow College Magazine	297

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1870.

ART. I.—THE THEORY OF DENOMINATIONAL EDUCATION. — PROSPECTS OF LEGISLATION ON POOR SCHOOLS.

1. *Address of the Irish Bishops*, Aug. 18, 1869.
2. *Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of Popular Education in England, and of their Assistant Commissioners*. Vols. 1 to 6. Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1861.
3. *Report to the Commissioners on the Common School System of the United States and of Upper and Lower Canada*. By the Rev. JAMES FRASER. Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1866.
4. *Report of the Commissioners of Council on Education, 1868-9*. Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1869.
5. *Popular Education at Home and Abroad, being Extracts from the Reports of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of Popular Education in England, and of their Assistant Commissioners on Popular Education in Germany, the United States, Canada, Holland, Switzerland, and France*. Burns, Oates, & Co. 1869.

THE measure dealt out to the Church by her opponents is often so unfair, that it would be ludicrous if it were not so deplorable. Take an instance. There is no particular on which Catholics are more perseveringly assailed, than their alleged "narrowness" in attaching so much value to "speculative dogmata." What can be more paltry and contemptible, it is asked, than to draw out a number of unintelligible "metaphysical" propositions; force them down the throat of an oppressed laity; and lay stress, not on men's piety and love of God, but on their readiness in accepting and echoing these theological conundrums? Catholics reply again and again, that their dogma is anything rather than unpractical; that on the contrary, if duly grasped and pondered, it influences most powerfully the interior character; that God revealed it for this very purpose; that he who founds his life on its thought possesses in consequence an immeasurably more elevated moral and spiritual character, than can result from the agency of any other religion in the whole world. However, Catholics may as well be silent for any effect which their arguments seem to produce. The very same objection is repeated again and

again, "usque ad nauseam." It is voted by the whole Protestant world, that the very peculiarity of Catholics is their laying almost exclusive stress on a stiff and dry so-called orthodoxy, which has no connection with practical morality and with the love of God.

So things pass on, till the *education* question starts up in one form or other: but then, all of a sudden, the Church and her representatives are assailed from the precisely opposite quarter. "What can be more unreasonable than your pretensions? We offer you every facility for having Catholic children taught their catechism, and yet you are not contented. You wish not merely to superintend their doctrinal instruction (for this we fully permit), but to influence their whole practical life." Certainly Catholic priests do put forth this claim, and can never abandon it except by ceasing to *be* Catholic priests. They are true throughout to their text. What they value, is not the mere husk of dogma, but its animating and vivifying effects. Their idea of education is not that a young person shall learn by heart a certain given catechism, or acquire the habit of repeating a certain doctrinal exposition, and that the Church shall leave him at that point. She would thus leave unaccomplished not only her *principal* work, but (one may almost say) her *sole* work; for she would leave unaccomplished that, without which the rest is valueless. It is involved in the very idea of any complete Catholic education, that its recipients (1) shall be trained really and heartily to apprehend revealed verities; and (2) that they shall learn the very difficult art, of practically applying those verities to all the complicated emerging circumstances of every-day life.

To have been Catholicly educated then, is not to have been taught the external expression of Catholic dogma, but to have been interiorly and pervasively imbued with that highest of intellectual possessions, the true and full *Catholic spirit*. But this task cannot be accomplished with any sufficient effectiveness or security, under any imaginable system of mixed education. The very principal instrument available to the Church for her purpose, is the providing that a youthful Catholic shall breathe an exclusively Catholic atmosphere; that all those under whose influence he is brought, shall think and feel those very thoughts and feelings, with which she desires *him* to be most efficaciously inspired.

In our last number we explained (p. 436) what is meant by "a Catholic atmosphere"; and we also (pp. 439—442) drew out to the best of our power the philosophical principles, which establish the conclusion we have just stated.* Here we will give one obvious illustration. In some given country—such a supposition is easily

* We incorporate here and there in this article a few sentences from its predecessor.

imaginable—it is necessary, for high political reasons, that a true *military spirit* be diffused throughout the population. What course will be adopted by the Government in order to that object? Provision will, as a matter of course, be made, that all inhabitants of the country shall, during the season of their youth while their character still remains pliant and susceptible of impressions, serve for a given period in the army, and be thus brought into practical and living contact with that spirit wherewith it is sought to imbue them. No other plan for effecting the desired object would so much as enter men's minds; the plainest common sense points to one, and one only, practical course: and as the end is really prized, the necessary means will be at once recognized and adopted. But let us suppose that some wiseacre were to rise up and make a different proposal. "The military spirit," so he argues, "is the legitimate efflux and correlative of certain military *doctrines*. I will draw out then a list of those doctrines, and put them into a catechism. Children shall be required to learn this catechism by heart; they shall have its meaning explained to them by authorized military teachers; and they shall undergo periodical examinations in it before competent military authority. Here is all you desire: take no further trouble; your children will be found to possess the true and full military spirit." We need not ask how such a proposal would be received by all who have not taken leave of their senses.

But in fact this illustration is quite inadequate to the issue before us. The military spirit is in harmony with many of man's strongest inclinations, and it is a comparatively easy task therefore to disseminate it; whereas the Catholic spirit is profoundly repugnant to the natural man, and its infusion requires every available resource which may be at the Church's disposal. Again, the military spirit is by no means opposed to other spirits elsewhere prevalent; nor would any one have a tendency to lose it, by the mere fact of mixing in general society ever so widely and promiscuously. But the Catholic spirit, let it never be forgotten, is *antagonistic* to every other, which is not included in itself.* "He that is not with Me is against Me." Its purity suffers detriment from all intercourse—however inevitable and even obligatory that intercourse may be—with those external to its influence.

It is particularly in these later centuries, and more particularly still in Protestant countries, that an exclusively Catholic education becomes of such paramount importance. In early times, so profound was the antipathy between Catholics on the one hand and

* By this exception we mean to express, that the Catholic spirit is not simply antagonistic to that e.g. of pious Tractarians; but that this arises only from the circumstance of certain Tractarians having caught the Church's spirit in some measure and degree.

heretics and infidels on the other, that no amount of physical juxtaposition could engender amalgamation of spirit. Then came those ages, during which Europe was exclusively Catholic, and in which therefore the present question was not practical. But in modern times, and especially in Protestant countries, there is (as every one knows) a large amount of cordial and even intimate intercourse between the Church's children and externs; and Catholics are constantly brought into contact with non-Catholic literature. We are not here considering, how far all this is legitimate and how far it is excessive.* At all events it is most obvious that, where such is the habit of Catholics, it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of imbuing Catholic youth to the utmost possible extent with pure Catholic instincts.†

These principles are applicable to Catholic education through its whole length and breadth. Our present concern, however, is not chiefly with Catholic education in general, but rather with that portion of it which comes into contact with political action; that portion of it which, within these islands, may probably be affected by intervention of the legislature. On reflection, it will be found that this portion embraces the two extremes. On the one hand the interests of Catholic *popular* education may be indefinitely promoted or thwarted, by the conditions which Parliament may attach to school subvention; and far more were it to adopt any measure of compulsory education. On the other hand the higher education of leisured Catholics cannot but be seriously affected by any enactments which may be made as to those academical degrees which the State shall recognize. We will consider the two subjects successively; and show in either case how essential it is, that the education and the whole educational system shall be, so far as Catholics are concerned, exclusively Catholic. We reserve all details for future treatment: our present purpose is merely to give a general conspectus of existing phenomena, considered under the light of Catholic principle. First then as to popular education.

What the Church aims at in her education of a Catholic child, is firstly, and as a foundation, that he shall intimately apprehend Catholic dogma: that he shall have formed in his mind the one true impression, on Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; on our Blessed Lady; on prayer; on the Sacraments, &c. &c. Then, this foundation having been laid, the second great desideratum is, that he shall learn the art (one may almost say the knack) of "living

* The "Month" of last May (p. 421) speaks of the "books and newspapers and magazines which English Catholics too often think themselves at liberty to read." It adds that, in consequence, if they have not been guarded by a careful Catholic education, "they will stand in proximate danger of losing the Faith."

† On "Catholic instincts" see our last number, pp. 435-6.

to" these great verities ; of imbuing his interior life with them as with its animating principle ; of ever preserving their thought in his mind, as of actively energizing implicit premisses. We are not here to consider all the various methods used by her for this great purpose. But it is important to point out, as indeed we have already pointed out in this very article, that the most important of all is the "surrounding him with a Catholic atmosphere" ; the securing, that those under whose influence he is brought, shall think and feel those very thoughts and feelings, with which she desires *him* to be implicitly but most efficaciously imbued.

Then further, what is the chief instrument used by the Church in order to save her children of this lowest class from crime and sin, and to foster within them the earnest love of God ? Indubitably the agency of her ministers. This is her practical aim in dealing with a poor child ; that he shall be trained to regard her priests as his trusted and trustworthy guides in all the  important affairs of life. But mixed education tells powerfully in a direction precisely opposite. Under this system, a priest is known to Catholic poor children, somewhat as the drawing or music master is presented to young persons of a higher class. He is presented to them, not as their one legitimate adviser and as the director and superintendent of their mental and moral training, but simply as the imparter of one particular episodal accomplishment.

We have no wish at all to exaggerate. The Church of course, under circumstances however unfavourable, will do the best she can : nor do we deny that, even under a mixed system, she may achieve important results. But it is the simple truth to say, that mixed education absolutely incapacitates her from training her children a single step in her own chosen way. She acts as best she may under a method totally alien from her own ; and Catholic children are educated, not as she desires to educate them, but in a way entirely *opposed* to that which she prefers. So far as this state of things is forced on her, she suffers under a veritable persecution.

Here three questions are briefly to be presented, on which there is some difference of opinion among good Catholics.

1. Is the existence of a *conscience-clause* in schools consistent with the Catholic principle of education ? It seems to us that there are two importantly different senses, in which this phrase "conscience-clause" is sometimes used ; and that the question cannot be satisfactorily discussed, unless this distinction is carefully kept in mind.

According to the sense in which some have understood this phrase, any Catholic school bound by a conscience-clause would be thus circumstanced. So long as Protestant children are present, no Catholic prayer could be recited by the rest ; nor could any Catholic symbols—crucifixes, images of our Blessed Lady and the

Saints, &c. &c.—be publicly exhibited. The general discipline of the school could not be used as an instrument for imbuing the children with a Catholic spirit; the offences of Catholic children could not be publicly rebuked on Catholic grounds, nor Catholic motives be proposed as incentives to exertion and good conduct. This is substantially the theory of the Irish so-called “national education,” against which the Irish bishops have of late so energetically protested. If carried into practice (which in Ireland, however, has by no means commonly been the case), it becomes the direct contradictory of Catholic education. Catholics must most certainly then contest against any conscience-clause in *this* sense, as for a matter of life and death.

But there is another very different sense of the word, according to which a Catholic school so bound would be far less unfavourably circumstanced than in the former illustration. The teacher would not indeed be permitted to instruct Protestant children in any religious doctrine whatever: but he would not be at all debarred by their presence from addressing Catholic children on Catholic grounds; from assembling Catholic children in Catholic prayer; from publicly exhibiting the crucifix and other Catholic symbols. Whether, even in this modified form, a conscience-clause be admissible, is a question on which we offer no decided opinion; though our own strong bias is towards an affirmative reply. Of course indeed it is only admissible as the least of two evils: still we think it very important to keep in as clear light as possible the broad distinction which exists, between two different senses of the same phrase.

2. A second question debated among Catholics is, whether it falls within the State's competence to enforce *compulsory* education. An able and interesting article, which appeared in the “Month” of last September, took for granted (pp. 219, et seq.) an affirmative answer to the question. On the other hand, F. Riess, as we mentioned in our number for October, 1868 (p. 544), maintains that such a theory must issue in socialism as its result. In citing F. Riess's opinion, we expressly stated that we by no means committed ourselves to concurrence with it; and we find it very difficult to arrive at any clear conclusion on the matter. We think it of some moment just now, that the question shall receive a far fuller and profounder theological examination than (so far as we know) has yet been given it.

3. Thirdly, it may be asked—assuming that the second question were answered in the affirmative—whether there could be any compulsory education enforced by the State, which would in fact be serviceable to Catholic interests. On this question the “Month” seems to have somewhat changed its bias after reflection: in September it suggested an affirmative answer, whereas in November (p. 434) it more than inclined to the negative. At all events, as

regards any attempt to enforce compulsory *mixed* education—though we feel with our contemporary how far this is from an *immediately* probable supposition—we cannot do better than repeat his very forcible words (p. 435). Any such imaginable proposal “ought to be resisted by Catholics with as much resolution and tenacity, as if it were an Act of Parliament ordering them to throw all their children into the fire as soon as they were born.”

We now come to the higher education of leisured Catholics. And of this we may truly say, that in these islands it is without exception the most critical and anxious question of the day. Catholicity is not now menaced by special heresy or false theological dogma, but by what may be called the spirit of the age; the principles of Liberalism; the subtle poison of Indifferentism. If the Church is enabled to hold her own and sufficiently to repel these enemies, she will become the one conservative element of England, its one regenerating and saving influence. Otherwise she will lose even her present position; she will dwindle down by degrees to a small and insignificant sect, tolerated because harmless. Which of these results may be expected? It is very far from an improbable supposition, that the alternative will depend on this simple issue, whether educated laymen do or do not work in profound sympathy and agreement with the clergy and with Catholic doctrine. But the clergy will assuredly be faithful to Catholic doctrine in its fulness and integrity; never was there a time when this prophecy might more securely be made. It is far from improbable then, that England's whole future turns on the question, whether the Catholic leisured classes do or do not receive an education which shall be purely and pervasively orthodox. And it is the concluding years of this education, which may be so seriously and permanently influenced by political measures of this present moment.

Now it is the concluding years of the educational course, which give to what has gone before its full meaning and significance. Hitherto the student has acquired much explicit religious and much explicit secular knowledge: the characteristic work of the last period, is blending the two into one harmonious whole. He knows Christian doctrine in itself: he has to be trained in the habit of measuring, by its standard, the whole field of philosophy, history, and literature. As the soul in its indivisible integrity animates alike every separate part of the human frame, and (by thus animating it) blends it into one;—so the highly-educated Catholic welds the whole mass of his knowledge into one solid and consistent organism, by the implicit presence, throughout every separate portion, of the Church's unifying doctrinal system.

What is necessary in order that this result may be insured? It is necessary that the student shall breathe an exclusively Catholic atmosphere; that all his instruction, which bears directly

or indirectly on religion, shall be imparted by Catholic teachers, and so imparted as most clearly to impress on his mind this bearing; that the course of studies shall be carefully mapped out by Catholic superiors, with a view to this all-important end. In the latter condition one further particular is of course included. Should Catholics be brought for examination before any board not exclusively Catholic, secure provision must be made, that there be the fullest power of adequately preparing youths for that examination, without important deviation from that course of study which, on exclusively Catholic grounds, is judged desirable. These principles are embodied by the Irish Episcopate in those admirable resolutions which we printed last October (pp. 482-4), and which we have named at the head of this article. As the "Month" most truly observes, in a Catholic country like Ireland the people have full right to expect a Catholic University. This however, for the purpose of making every possible concession, the bishops are prepared to waive; and we cannot do better for illustration of our general argument, than quote three of their resolutions.

V.—As regards higher education, since the Protestants of this country have had a Protestant University for three hundred years, and have it still, the Catholic people of Ireland clearly have a right to a Catholic University.

VI.—But should Her Majesty's Government be unwilling to increase the number of Universities in this country, the bishops declare that religious equality cannot be realized, unless the degrees, endowments, and other privileges enjoyed by their fellow-subjects of a different religion be placed within the reach of Catholics in the fullest sense of equality. The injustice of denying to them a participation in those advantages except at the cost of principle and conscience, is aggravated by the consideration that whilst they contribute their share to the public funds for the support of educational institutions from which conscience warns them away, they have moreover to tax themselves for the education of their children in their own colleges and university.

VII.—Should it please Her Majesty's Government, therefore, to remove the many grievances to which Catholics are subjected by existing university arrangements, and to establish one national university in this kingdom for examining candidates and conferring degrees, the Catholic people of Ireland are entitled in justice to demand that in such university, or annexed to it—

(a.) They shall have a distinct college, conducted upon purely Catholic principles, and at the same time fully participating in the privileges enjoyed by other colleges of whatsoever denomination or character.

(b.) That the university honours and emoluments be accessible to Catholics equally with their Protestant fellow-subjects.

(c.) That the examinations and all other details of university arrangement be free from every influence hostile to the religious sentiments of Catholics; and that with this view the Catholic element be adequately represented upon the senate, or other supreme university body, by persons

enjoying the confidence of the Catholic bishops, priests, and people of Ireland.

Irish bishops then will be satisfied with an arrangement, which gives Catholics an exclusively Catholic education in a mixed university. It may be asked with some momentary surprise, how this consists with the line recently taken up by the Holy See and the English bishops, against the establishment of a Catholic college at Oxford or Cambridge. "The bishops are unanimous," such was the declaration, "in their disapproval of the establishing of a Catholic college at any of the Protestant universities; . . . and in forming" their judgment "*they were guided by those principles which the Church has ever maintained in the matter of education.*" A very little consideration however will show, how *toto cœlo* different is the proposal accepted by the Irish bishops, from that which the English bishops so energetically condemned.

In the first place, Oxford and Cambridge are not mixed universities, but exclusively non-Catholic. It would follow therefore, from the proposed Oxford arrangement, that a Catholic's whole course of study (which must, of course, be adapted to the examination he will undergo) should be prescribed to him by those who are relentless and (commonly) violent enemies to his religion. Such a state of things would be calamitous beyond expression. Far better that Catholics should receive no higher education at all, than that they should receive one every detail of which is practically determined by the Church's enemies. On the other hand, if the Irish bishops' demand is granted, "the examinations" will be "free from every influence hostile to the religious sentiments of Catholics." It would thus follow that the Irish Catholic bishops could exercise a decisive veto, against any such course of examination, as they might judge likely to exercise an injurious influence on the purity of Catholic doctrine. Such a scheme, doubtless, is much less satisfactory than that of an Irish Catholic University; still it is one which would confer signal benefits on Irish Catholic education. But nothing in the least like this could be expected at Oxford.

There is a contrast however of more fundamental importance even than this, between the plan suggested by the Irish bishops and that of a Catholic college at Oxford or Cambridge. The former plan would in no way lead to any sully of the Catholic collegiate atmosphere, nor to any intimate association between Catholic and non-Catholic students. If the present Catholic University were affiliated to-morrow to a mixed Irish university, there would be no more intimacy between its students and those of Trinity College than exists at this moment: in other words, there would be none whatever. But the member of a Catholic college at Oxford would be on terms of the freest and most unreserved social intercourse

with members of other colleges. We laid especial stress on the terrible magnitude of this evil, when we originally argued against the scheme (October, 1864). We admitted fully that, as regards the keenest and most earnest intellects, "the higher intellectual education finds an invaluable instrument in the free intercourse of mind with mind, in the healthy collision of opinion and taste, in the combined efforts towards investigating truth put forth by those youthful spirits who are eager for its attainment. But we hold this," we added, "under one all-important qualification—viz., that those questions alone shall be regarded as open which are really so ; and that all which is supremely and divinely certain be accepted by the whole community with profound submission. It is for this very reason that we regard a Catholic University or higher College as so eminently desirable ; in order that Catholic youths may be brought together at the period when truth is most eagerly sought, and when mutual influence is most powerful and most healthy. Thus the practical impression of those great verities which are held by all is constatly strengthened in each ; and the general application of those verities is day by day more thoroughly mastered and understood. 'In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas': such is the genuine University motto. It is true, no doubt, and greatly to be regretted, that English Catholics are few, and that the University circle would be far narrower than could be wished. We cannot doubt, however, that discerning Catholic teachers will spontaneously adopt the best remedy for this defect, by making it an important part of their business to cultivate personal and friendly relations with those under their care, and encourage them to the freest communication of opinion and feeling."

On the other hand, how can a keen and inquiring youth be really imbued with the Catholic spirit, unless he breathe an exclusively Catholic atmosphere? Such a person is in general far more powerfully influenced by companions of his own age, possessing intellectual endowments similar to his own, than by those older and more mature. He finds in the former a freshness of mind, a readiness of sympathy, a corresponding susceptibility of impression, an unreservedness, a frankness in comparing notes and admitting difficulties, nay, a congeniality arising from the very fact that they are of the same age with himself, which are most attractive to an ardent inquirer after truth, and which are found to a much less extent in the society of older men. There could not then well be a greater calamity, than that he should be brought into habits of familiar intimacy with youths of commanding power, whose keenest interest lies in a discussion of those very problems, religious and social, which Catholicity purports to solve, and who are unanimous in holding as a first principle that its

method of solution is narrow and foolish.* Indeed, it is the strong bias of our own judgment, that in various highly important respects far less injury would be done by individual Catholics resorting to non-Catholic colleges, than would result from a Catholic college at Oxford or Cambridge : if indeed we may, without offence, make the imaginable, though impossible, supposition, that the English bishops could sanction either one scheme or the other. We can quite fancy an amiable but common-place Catholic youth going up to Oxford and passing creditably enough through his appointed course of studies—indulging abundantly in the society and innocent amusements of the place—and returning home not so very greatly the worse. Negatively indeed he is a great sufferer, from not having been imbued, as he might have been, with Catholic truth ; and the fine edge of his Catholic sensitiveness will certainly have been altogether worn down : but, on the other hand, he may have received no ineffaceable impressions, which will seriously impair his future docility to the Church and the Holy See. Such a youth, it may be said, has breathed not so much an anti-Catholic as a non-Catholic and neutral atmosphere. It is not such as he—we have urged this again and again before now—but rather those pre-eminent for active intellect, who are so profoundly injured by early familiarity with non-Catholics. But let us suppose there were a Catholic College at Oxford. It would then be a matter of course that every member of it, however ordinary and common-place in mind and character, should follow the lead of its abler students ; should accept their line of opinion as authoritative ; should carry with him from college a strong conviction, that they and no others are the legitimate directors of Catholic thought. But these abler students would most assuredly have received a deadly infection from the pestilential atmosphere they have breathed. And thus the College would become a permanent and traditional home of unsound and disloyal Catholicism ; an ever-flowing source, for diffusing among Catholics the poison of a worldly, indifferentist, indocile spirit.

One further remark, before quitting this part of our subject. The “ Month ” has for some time past been urging on the attention of Catholics the intolerable evil of their present connection

* A truly admirable series of articles from the pen of Professor Quinlan has appeared in the “ Tablet ” on Trinity College, Dublin. We hope to notice them in detail, when we write particularly on the Irish University question ; but we may as well quote here a passage which appeared on Oct. 23. “ Some few ” educated at Trinity College “ fell away altogether : but in how many more was the religious sense utterly blunted and deadened ? Every one mixing in the better class of Irish Catholic society is familiar with this latter sad psychological phase. We are constantly pained at seeing educated Catholics quite lukewarm about their religion, and showing by their conversation and writings an utter absence of all sound Catholic feeling.”

with London University : and we heartily concur with our contemporary's judgment. Oxford and Cambridge examinations however present (in our view) even graver perils to the Catholic, than any to be dreaded from London : while yet on the other hand there is a certain number of Catholics, for whose temporal interest it is of great importance that they shall obtain a degree recognized by the State. If such a university be instituted in Ireland as the Irish bishops suggest, its examinations would be the natural resort of Englishmen thus circumstanced.

And now one final inquiry will be made. Why, instead of "exclusively Catholic," do we speak in our title of "denominational" education ? For this simple reason, that Catholics of these kingdoms put forth politically no claim whatever in their own behalf, which they do not equally put forth in behalf of *every* Christian denomination. We shall presently maintain that even *justice* requires such a course at their hands ; but it is most evident, on the surface, that any farther claim would be *inexpedient* in a degree which cannot be possibly exaggerated. Catholics constitute in these kingdoms an unpopular minority ; and to agitate for any special favour, would be but to load their cause with obloquy, and to secure overwhelming defeat.

Then again it is immeasurably better, for the country's religious welfare, that the children of Anglicans shall be trained in Anglicanism, of Wesleyans in Wesleyanism, of Unitarians in Unitarianism, than that all children should be trained alike in that miserable negation of religion, which is sometimes called an undogmatic creed. But the interests of religion, it need not be said, are at once the interests of God and the interests of the Church ; and these must of course be the predominant aim of all truly Catholic politicians.

But in truth we are thoroughly prepared to argue, though this is not the place for doing so, that in a country circumstanced like this, the only course which its Government can pursue, without violating the strict claims of justice, is the securing equal liberty of education to all Christian denominations. We must here be content with confidently *stating* this proposition : for it would require a separate article to draw out its proofs in detail, and to vindicate it from all suspicion of disloyalty to such Pontifical instructions, as the "*Mirari vos*" and the Syllabus.

We have now exhibited, though in the most shadowy skeleton outline, what seems to us the true lie of the education question in these islands. And we have done this according to two cross divisions : accordingly as the question concerns (1) England or Ireland *respectively* ; and accordingly as it concerns (2) popular or

1. In future numbers we shall have to treat these

four separate elements at much greater length and in much greater detail, as circumstances of the moment may require: but we think we shall be able to do this with far better effect, by having thus prefixed (so to speak) a general conspectus of the whole issue.

Such then are the principles which, as it seems to us, should animate every Catholic politician in his whole conduct on the matter. All other political questions of the day shrink into absolute insignificance when compared with this. The whole religious—nay, the whole political—future of these islands in all probability hangs on the issue. And all Catholics, who are able to exercise political influence, must unite themselves politically heart and soul with that large band of zealous Protestants, who will contend to the death for the vital principle of purely denominational education.

When we wrote the above remarks, we were under an impression that in all probability the Irish land question would so occupy the attention of Parliament this year as to leave no room for a large educational measure. But since they went to press, it has come to be almost certain that some comprehensive plan of popular education will be brought forward by Government; and this being so, we feel the extreme importance of doing whatever we can towards placing the facts of the case in their true light. They are detailed and discussed at large, indeed, in the massy volumes of "Reports." These, however, few will be able and willing to study. We therefore specially recommend all to procure and read carefully the short and unanswerable pamphlet which we have placed, with them, at the head of this article, and of which we have elsewhere given a summary, which makes it needless to enter here into the details. And, in addition to this, as the United States are the country in which mixed education is generally supposed to answer best, we would specially recommend a very important pamphlet by Mr. Cromwell, which costs only sixpence, and which will abundantly dispel that delusion, showing that the "common schools" are felt by a large class in America to be most dangerous both to religion and morals. We can hardly exaggerate our sense of its value in the present state of the controversy.

We now propose to call attention chiefly to the recommendations of the Commissioners rather than to the important facts on which they are founded. First, however, we must notice the statement of Sir J. K. Shuttleworth, who boasts that the body of commissioners and assistant-commissioners by whom this vast mass of valuable information has been collected and digested, and who have given their deliberate judgment upon its results, are "men representing every phase of political and religious opinion." We have no doubt it was intended that they should be so. He would probably con-

sider it a mere cavil to reply, that although they were not less than twenty in all, all the twenty were Protestants, there was not one Catholic among them. This was so entirely according to precedent, long established and universally followed, that in all probability there was no more deliberate intention of excluding Catholics from the Commission than there was of excluding horses and dogs; simply because it never seemed to any one possible to appoint either. Of course Sir J. K. Shuttleworth will not feel that this affects the correctness of his statement. Catholics are not "men of any phase of political and religious opinion." Still it seems that omissions of this kind, much as they appear a matter of course to English authorities, are found inconvenient in practice. When the assistant-commissioners began their inquiries in France, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, the United States, and Canada, they found the inconvenience; and as we presume that the object of the Commission was to obtain full information, that object was so far frustrated. The Rev. J. Pattison reports from Germany (vol. iv. p. 165):—"I found myself at a very early period obliged to renounce inquiry into Catholic education. The present increasing influence of the Roman Catholic Church makes this subject one of great moment, as also of special difficulty." Both this gentleman and the Rev. J. Fraser, who reported upon America, candidly report that they "had not time" to examine into Catholic schools. It must be recollected that in Prussia more than one-third of the population is Catholic, and that Mr. Pattison was informed by Protestants that "the influence of the Roman Catholic Church is increasing in Germany." Mr. Fraser also reports, evidently on Protestant authority, that "Roman Catholicism bids fair to be the dominant faith over the whole American Continent"; to which we must add two other facts: first, that the commissioners themselves report that even in England the Roman Catholic week-day schools contain more scholars than any others, except the Church of England and the British schools (vol. i. p. 306); and next, that it appears from the correspondence published by them (vol. iv. p. 680) that their attention was specially called to the importance of appointing Catholic commissioners. That notwithstanding all this, the possibility of doing so does not appear to have crossed their minds is, to say the least, unlucky; for, strange as it may seem to Sir J. K. Shuttleworth, there really are in the world those who think that Catholics actually are men and women, and that their offspring are boys and girls; nay more, that they really have "religious and political opinions" of their own, and not least upon the subject of education; and that when an inspector has not time to ascertain anything about their schools, it must be regretted that want of time prevented his fully examining the facts connected with education.

It should therefore be borne in mind that if the facts reported by the Commissioners and their inferences from them agree, in the main, with the conclusions to which Catholics have come, this is not because they had any voice in the Commission, which was confined to "men [*i.e.* Protestants] of every phase of political and religious opinions."

This being the case, it is at least satisfactory to find, not only that the mass of the facts reported by the Commissioners and their assistants fully bear out the convictions of Catholics with regard to the proposal to establish compulsory secular education supported by local rates; but that the recommendations of the commissioners in the main agree with them.

The general principle upon which almost every one who, for the last half-century, has endeavoured to promote popular education has proceeded, has been, that a large portion of the poorer classes of the population were in a condition injurious to their own interests and discreditable to the rest of the community; that it was the duty and the interest of the nation at large to raise them to a higher level, and that religious education was the most powerful instrument for the promotion of this object. This has been the feeling which has stirred the zeal of those volunteers who, with very small aid from Government, have built and maintained the existing popular schools in England and Wales, who have, in fact, done so much for popular education, and who, with a moderate increase of Government aid, and more elasticity in Government regulations, can readily, and upon the best system, do all that, under existing circumstances, is humanly possible. This system has existed in England for more than twenty-one years, has expanded by gradual accretion like most other useful English institutions, has during that period been subject to frequent parliamentary discussions, which have sifted every objection if they have not added every improvement; and as the Commissioners justly remark, during those years, "No other system has been devised which the nation could be induced to adopt, and this raises a strong presumption that the deliberate feeling of the public is in favour of the existing system."

The practical difficulties of any interference with existing schools are thus stated by the Commissioners:—"During the last twenty years several thousand schools have been established in connection with the system in different parts of the country. These schools are private property, and the founders of many of them are still living. They are connected with particular religious denominations, and the fact of that connection formed the chief inducement to the subscribers to contribute towards their foundation. Their foundation deeds were drawn up in a great measure under the direction of the Government. The managers would, in our opinion, be very

harshly treated if the assistance at present given to them were transferred to schools founded on a different principle, without any proof that they had failed to render the services for which the grants were paid; or if they were refused further contributions, except upon the terms of altering the constitution which they were so lately compelled by public authority to accept, and upon the faith of which such contributions were made."

"The Government contributes about a quarter to the income of the schools which receive annual grants," or, in other words, every £25 contributed by Government has caused £75 to be contributed from other sources. What public money spent upon public improvement has secured co-operation to such an extent? It has "raised the standard of education by improving the general character of education throughout the country" through its inspection; the only question, perhaps, being whether the benefits of this inspection might, as in France, be secured at a less cost; and whilst "it has enlisted, in the promotion of education, a large amount of religious activity, it has practically left the management of the schools in the hands of the different denominations. In these respects," as the Commissioners report, "it has been most successful."

The Commissioners also express their opinion "that the existing plan is the only one by which it would be possible to secure the religious character of popular education," and, instead of arguing the abstract question whether this be desirable or not, they declare "that it is the deliberate opinion of the great majority of persons in this country that it is desirable"; and as one proof of this they mention the "fact that, with hardly an exception, every endowment for purposes of education, from the universities down to the smallest village school, has been connected with some religious body."

After referring to other modes, (1) "either by restricting the teaching to points upon which different denominations agree, or (2) by providing that the religious instruction should be given at particular hours and by the ministers of different denominations," they say they "do not think that either of these expedients would be suitable to the state of feeling in this country"; and in stating their reasons against these modes, they quote a resolution of the Wesleyan Committee of Education on Sir J. Pakington's Bill, "that the Wesleyan community will never consent that the teaching of religion itself in their schools shall be subject to restriction. Their experience shows that, besides the Scripture lesson with which their schools daily open, and in which it is sought to make divine truth intelligible to children of all capacities, an able Christian teacher will find throughout the day, when teaching geography, history, physical and moral science, and the knowledge of common things, frequent occasion to illustrate and enforce the truths of religion, and that religious teaching may be made to impart life

and spirit to the whole process of education." They might have quoted to the same effect the strong but true remark of Dr. Arnold (mentioned by Mr. Fraser, p. 248): "They talk of separating religious and secular teaching; I cannot understand them. Give me a lesson to teach in geography and I will make it religious." It is clear that any lesson may have the perfume of religion imparted to it by a religious master, and that the poison of indifference, even of a tendency to infidelity, may be communicated to the young mind in any lesson by an irreligious master.

The Commissioners therefore report that "the leading principles of the present system are sound, that they have shown themselves well adapted to the feelings of the country, and that they ought to be maintained."

The Commissioners next state the objections to the extension of the present system, so as to extend its benefits to the whole country. Only one is worth considering, the estimated cost. They say:—

According to the most careful estimate we have been able to make, which is based upon a calculation of an increase in the number of pupil-teachers and in the augmentation grant, the extension of the general system to the whole country would cost about £1,300,000, if the unassisted *public* schools alone were brought under it. If the scholars in private schools were added, the sum would amount to about £1,620,000. And, supposing an increase in the number of scholars of 20 per cent., in consequence of an improvement in attendance, it would be increased to about £1,800,000 yearly. To this sum, if the present system were unaltered, would have to be added a capitation grant for 2,300,000 children; and at the present rate of attendance, which is an increasing one, at least 800,000 of these would earn six shillings a head. This would make the whole grant amount to nearly £2,100,000 a year. Even supposing this to be the extreme point to which the present grant could possibly reach, it seems to us too large a sum to throw upon the general revenue for an object the benefits of which are in a great measure local.

In answer to this, it would seem enough to suggest that the whole calculation rests on the bases of the supposition that the benefits of the present system are extended to the whole kingdom, and that on this supposition these benefits will no longer be local, in the sense of extending only to certain places. It is no hardship that every part should pay for that by which every part is benefited.

But we may further ask in what cheaper mode, or rather in what other mode so cheap to the public purse, can the education of the people be accomplished as by an extension of the present system, which secures from other sources £75 for every £25 contributed by the Government? Probably this proportion might not be maintained after an extension to the whole country; but still the Government grant would insure contributions from other sources

if the schools remained under denominational management, which could not otherwise be expected.

The "local" objection does not, therefore, apply to an extended grant, and an extension of the present system is the most economical, as well as the best, mode of accomplishing popular education.

But even if this were not so, the Commissioners have answered their own objection when they remark (p. 313), with reference to "the expense of public assistance to the education of the poorer classes, and its tendency to increase, we desire to say that we think it unreasonable to object to it simply on both or either of these grounds. If it be assumed that it is proper for the State to render pecuniary aid towards the education of the lower classes, a large expenditure, where the area is so large, will be a necessary consequence; and upon the same assumption, it cannot be denied that the object is among the worthiest on which the public money can be expended."

The Commissioners say, "If the money be wisely and successfully applied, it is to be desired and expected that indefinitely for some considerable time the number of schools seeking to avail themselves of the public aid will increase as improved education is more and more widely diffused, and operates more powerfully on the public mind." But they also add: "One legitimate result of this, however, in a system which is based on assisting local exertion, ought to be a higher and more practical feeling of their duty by parents to provide for the education of their children; with this may reasonably be expected an increased liberality, on the part of the higher classes, to assist their poorer neighbours in the discharge of this great duty, and thenceforward we should have a right to look for a decrease, gradual at first, and then rapid, in the demands on the public purse." The reports on education in Germany and Switzerland show that the diffusion of education has a tendency to increase the spontaneous resort to it, general education there being a result of the habits of the people rather than of any compulsory law, and being as general in Frankfort and Geneva, where there is no compulsory law, as in the states of Germany and cantons of Switzerland, where such a law exists.

It is this fear of increasing the expenditure of the central Government upon local expenses which leads the Commissioners to propose that part of the expense of all schools, aided by a Government grant, should be met by a local rate. They propose to charge it on the county rate.

They further support this recommendation by the fact that the present system of Government aid does not reach many poor and thinly-inhabited country parishes. No doubt this difficulty would partly be met by a judicious union of parishes for school purposes (which they recommend in another part of their report). But

Mr. Fraser, himself a country clergyman, complains that in part at least it is caused by the negligence of absentee proprietors. With regard to residents he says:—

The school is a picturesque feature on the outskirts of the park ; it is an expected feature—one which visitors will like to see and will be sure to ask after—in the village adjacent to the hall ; and there, of course, it stands, tolerably cared for and duly admired. But rare indeed are the instances of landowners who, wherever they have property, seem to feel it a first duty to do something for the social and moral elevation of the people.

For our part we should not have ventured on such a criticism as this, which attributes to English absentee landed proprietors a flagrant neglect of duty, and even ascribes the support of a school near the proprietor's residence to an inferior, if not wrong, motive. We still venture to think that the genuine charitable motive is not so rare amongst English landed proprietors as Mr. Fraser seems to suppose ; if it be, there is more unsoundness than we have fancied in the hearts of English country gentlemen.

There can be no doubt that the building and maintenance of a school in a sparsely-populated country parish must cost more per child than in a town ; this is the necessity of the case, apart from any system, and must be so under every system ; and does not this suggest the necessity of modifying the Government regulations according to the circumstances of each case ? It is not merely in poor country parishes belonging to absentee proprietors where a difficulty is felt in meeting the regulations of Government ; but in very many instances, even in large and populous parishes, the poor Catholics resident there find it impossible to meet the rigid and inelastic Government requirements ; and consequently, the Government aid is too often refused where it is most needed. If the requirements of a freehold site, of a school building upon a certain expensive plan, of a certificated teacher, of a boarded floor, &c., had not been so rigidly insisted upon, might not schools have been established and kept in existence in many country parishes and many poor Catholic districts which have hitherto been deprived of Government aid because they were unable to comply with the Government requirements ? Has not the difficulty been thus in many instances created by Government itself ? We have even heard it insinuated that this has, through some agency or other in the Government office, been done purposely, in order to pave the way for a secular national system. We do not believe such a thing ; but the obstructive results of some of the Government regulations may have naturally tended to give rise to such a suspicion. If Government had somewhat accommodated its rules to the local and personal circumstances of each case, might not much more good have been done ? It may be said, that if this

disposition to relax rules had been shown at first, local and personal efforts would have been relaxed also, instead of being stimulated, and what has in some places, with extreme efforts, been done, would have been left undone. But has not the time arrived when Government may conclude that all that can be got has been got out of the willing horse; that voluntary efforts have been stimulated as far as they can be stimulated by Government rules; that in many poor parishes, and amongst many poor persons, it is simply impossible to comply with all the present Government requirements; and that therefore, in such cases and with such persons, the local and personal circumstances may be duly considered, and Government requirements and Government aid be accommodated to actual necessity, so as much more to assist in the establishment and maintenance of small, and possibly, in a material sense, inferior schools, and yet often as good as may at once be practicable? Now that so many schools have been founded in the more populous parts of the country and by more wealthy people, there is less danger from Government condescending to bend to the necessities of the poor. Some remarks of Mr. Matthew Arnold on the country schools of France suggest a pattern for imitation. He says:—

In the country districts the school buildings will not bear comparison, for completeness and architectural decoration, with those in the country districts in England. Buildings are very commonly adapted to school purposes instead of being expressly erected for them; but these schoolrooms are quite good enough to be exceedingly useful, and by condescending to use them, an education system can carry its schools and teachers into poor and remote communes which must else have remained strangers to them. I am bound to say that great good sense seemed to me to characterize French administration, both in its requirements and in its forbearance when dealing with schools: to take the much-disputed article of boarded floors, for instance, recommended generally in all schools, these have never been inflexibly required but for infant schools. Perhaps we may one day take a lesson from France in some of these respects. Not without doing violence to some crotchets, not without lopping off some elegant but superfluous branches of expenditure, will the plaything of philanthropists be converted into the machine of a nation.

One essential question was how far the existing system approaches to a sufficient provision for the education of the poor of England. The answer given by the Commissioners was, on the whole, satisfactory.

They state (vol. i. p. 293) “the population of England and Wales in 1858 as 19,523,103, and the number of children then on the school-books as 2,535,462, whilst 2,655,767 ought to have been on the books; thus, as they say, “leaving 120,305 children without any school instruction whatever.” This last remark, however, is not quite consistent with another statement which they

make at vol. i. p. 178, that "the name of almost every child is, at some time or other, on the books of some school at which it attends with more or less regularity"; and it is obvious that, as some who at any given time were in attendance may afterwards be absent, whilst others who were then absent afterwards attend, the probability is, not that the above 120,305 are without any school instruction whatever, but that a larger number do not attend with sufficient regularity to be properly instructed.

The Commissioners proceed:—"The proportion, therefore, of scholars in weekly schools of all kinds to the entire population was 1 in 7·7, or 12·99 per cent. Looking, therefore, at mere numbers as indicating the state of popular education in England and Wales, the proportion of children receiving instruction to the whole population is, in our opinion, nearly as high as can be reasonably expected. In Prussia, where it is compulsory, it is 1 in 6·27, in England and Wales, 1 in 7·7, in Holland 1 in 8·11, in France 1 in 9·0."

They also advert to "the surprisingly rapid progress of elementary education in this country since the beginning of the century," and quote returns in 1818, 1833, and 1851, showing the proportion of day scholars to the whole population to have been at those respective periods 1 in 17½, 1 in 11½, and 1 in 8·36, "while in 1858, according to our returns, they have risen to 1 in 7·7."

Mr. Pattison reports that, "In the autumn of 1855, the writing test applied to the year's levy of the Prussian Landwehr gave the astounding result that only 12 per cent. of the recruits were able to write well. Such returns are now very generally made in the various States; and though I have not been able to procure them, I believe I shall be under the mark if I state the average of recruits unable to write as 50 per cent. on the whole" (vol. iv. p. 234).

There is, then, some reason to say "that the results of the system of compulsion, as seen in Prussia, do not appear to be so much superior to those which have already been attained amongst ourselves by voluntary efforts, as to make us desire an alteration which would be opposed to the feelings, and in some respects to the principles, of this country" (i. p. 300).

Whilst we write (1869) the proportion of scholars to population must be still greater, for the increase has steadily continued. We have not the means of stating in exactly corresponding terms the present proportion, but the number of schools under inspection, and of scholars inspected, has increased year by year, for the Committee of Privy Council, in their last Report, say that "in the last three years (1866-8), an addition at the rate of 52,104 per annum has been made to the average annual number of day scholars *attending* the schools in receipt of annual grants, and an addition of 83,971 per annum to the number of such scholars *present* in the

same schools *on the day of inspection*"; we find also from the excellent "Statistics of Church of England Schools for the Poor in England and Wales," just issued, that the number of scholars in national or parochial week-day schools has increased from 1 in 15·5 in 1857 to 1 in 13 of the whole population in 1867, and we may fairly assume, therefore, that the number of scholars now on the books of all week-day schools in England and Wales very nearly approaches the Prussian proportional figure. The average attendance, of course, is very much less than the number on the books; but we are not alone, nor even the worst, in this irregularity of attendance, for it appears that "in England and Wales the average number of days of attendance in the year of each child in denominational schools is 125 out of the 220 days of which the school year consists, whilst in the United States this average is 106 days."

As to future grants to schools, from public sources, the Commissioners propose:—

1. A grant from the public revenue to all schools the building and general management of which are assisted by Her Majesty's Inspectors.

2. Another grant out of the county rate, on condition of the favourable report of an inspector, to be appointed by a proposed Local Board of Education, who is to examine the knowledge of the children.

The chief objection to this is that it does not meet the real evil already exposed by the Report, viz., that some proprietors, chiefly non-residents, wholly neglect to do anything towards the education of the children dependent on themselves. Now, the great object would be to compel these men to take their fair share. And this the proposed assistance from the county rate will not do, as they will only pay to it in the same proportion with their neighbours, who are already supporting schools. Would it not be possible to enable persons interested in education to demand that a school should be founded in districts where the neglect is gross, and that in such cases it should be supported by a local rate, not upon the inhabitants in general, but upon the owners of property in the immediate district?

When there is any considerable number of persons in any district who conscientiously object to the existing schools, it might perhaps be possible to adopt the plan which is found to work well in Canada. The Rev. James Fraser reports (p. 254):—"A Roman Catholic school may be established whenever any number of persons, not less than five, being heads of families and freeholders or householders, within any school section, incorporated village or town, or within any ward of any city or town, and being Roman Catholics, choose to convene a public meeting of persons desiring

to establish a separate school for Roman Catholics in such school section, or ward, for the election of trustees for the management of the same. A majority of the persons present, being freeholders or householders, and Roman Catholics, may elect three persons resident within such school section, or an adjoining section, as trustees; and any person of the age of twenty-one years, being a British subject, may be elected trustee, whether a freeholder or householder or not. Notice of such election of trustees, and of the establishment of such school is to be given to the township reeve or to the chairman of the board of common school trustees. The trustees of a separate school have the same duties and responsibilities as the trustees of a common school. They form a body corporate, and have power to impose, levy, and collect school-rates or subscriptions upon and from persons sending children to, or subscribing towards, the support of such separate school; and for that purpose are entitled to have a copy of the assessment roll of the municipality. Every person who gives notice in writing to the clerk of his municipality that he is a Roman Catholic, and a supporter of a separate school in the said or a contiguous municipality, shall be exempt from all common school rates in the said municipality so long as he continues to be a supporter of such separate school; but no person shall be deemed such a supporter unless he resides within three miles, in a direct line, of the site of the schoolhouse."

We have not space to examine in detail the proposed constitution of the local boards of education suggested by the Commissioners. This part of the plan does not seem to have been maturely considered, and would certainly not work, we believe would not be carried, without considerable modification.

One valuable part of the Commissioners' plan is to offer a premium upon any scholar, upon proof of a definite amount of knowledge, not requiring from the school any conditions beyond its being healthy and clean. The effect of this would be to assist many small schools, excluded from the grant by the present rules; and in many cases they would thus be enabled so far to improve their buildings, &c., as to obtain the higher grants. "Thus a school which should obtain £8 or £10 from this examination would receive both an aid and a stimulus, which would induce it to make greater exertions." The premium referred to is thus stated by the Commissioners:—"A sum, varying from 22s. 6d. to 21s. for every child who has attended the school during 140 days in the year preceding the day of examination, and who passes an examination in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and who, if a girl, also passes an examination in plain work." This examination the Commissioners propose to be by a country examiner, to be chosen by the local education board, and who must be "a certificated

schoolmaster of at least seven years' standing," whilst the inspectors report "on the discipline, efficiency, and general character of the school."

It is obvious that these examiners might just as well be appointed by the Committee of Council as by any local board, and that the above very suitable premium or grant might at once be extended to all examined schools if the Committee of Council adopted to-morrow so judicious a decision. Some such allowance for results, whether attained through a certificated master or not, and whether in a school with a boarded floor or not, has long been contended for, and nothing is needed for it but the willingness of officials, which would readily be backed by Parliament and the country.

As to cost, we may again refer to the Report of Mr. Matthew Arnold on French schools, where, after speaking of the small salaries and efficient examinations of French inspectors, he adds:—

The habits of our country are hardly compatible with official salaries as low as those of France. But there can be no doubt that a certain plainness and cheapness is an indispensable element of a plan of education which is to be very widely extended. In operations on a really vast scale, that rigid economy, even in the smallest matters, which in very limited operations may be thought overstrained, becomes an imperious necessity. The department to which I have the honour to belong is, perhaps, the most rigidly administered of any of the English public departments; it is of very recent date; it has grown up under the broad daylight of publicity. But its habits were formed when the schools under its supervision might be counted on the fingers. "On ne dote pas une armée," mournfully cries M. Eugène Rendu, contrasting the condition of French inspectors with that of their English brethren; but an army the English school inspectors must become if they are to meet the exigence of a national school system. Yet what nation can afford to employ in such a service 275 highly trained diplomatists, selected to conduct delicate negotiations with important Rectors? The thing is impossible; a vast body like that of the French inspectors must necessarily be taken from a large class, paid at a lower rate, and recruited in part, as the French inspectors are with eminent advantage recruited, from among the masters of elementary schools. "Should you not gain in some respects by having your inspectors drawn from a higher class in society?" I asked M. Magin. He said that the work of primary inspection was perfectly well done by the present staff, and, so far as I had the means of observing, I entirely agree with him.

The Commissioners conclude this part of their Report by declaring, "We especially adhere to the principles to which the present system is indebted for no small part of its success, non-interference both in the religious training which is given by different denominations of Christians, and absence of all central control over the direct management of schools. Omitting all other grounds on which we think this course desirable, our present inquiry has im-

pressed us with the conviction that no other is practicable in the present state of religious feeling in England. Not only does it seem to us certain that the members of all religious bodies would be dissatisfied with any change in this respect, but the fact that religious education has been working with success upon this basis during the last twenty years, has given to this principle a position in the country from which any attempt to dislodge it would destroy much that has been gained, and would give a dangerous shock to our system of education."

In comparing mixed and denominational education, one thing strikes us at first sight, although we are not surprised that the Commissioners do not seem to have been struck by it. Mixed education, if it favours any one, favours the minority, denominational the majority. Can we doubt that this is the real reason why, hitherto, the same men have been in very many cases strenuous in supporting denominational education in England, and in opposing it in Ireland? For in Ireland the Protestants are the minority, in England the Catholics.

Against compulsory education the report of the Commissioners is decisive. They, however, seem favourable to the plan of extending to all occupations the "half-time" clauses of the Factory Act, of which the Rev. J. Marshall says:—"It has, so far as my experience and observation enable me to judge, been eminently successful, and is, I think, the best mode of applying a compulsory motive to the parents, and ought to be extended to all employments of the working classes without exception, by such steps and with such modifications as may be found necessary"; of course taking due care that no child is sent to any school except such as may be approved by its parents.

The other modes of indirect compulsion suggested are, that parents should pay school fees for their children, whether they attend school or not; and that no boy or girl should be employed who does not produce a certificate of having passed a certain school examination. These and possibly other suggestions deserve careful consideration. The object aimed at is good, but care must be taken that, in the endeavour to attain it, hardship be not inflicted or conscience violated. The chief difficulty is in agricultural labour.

The Committee of Council, in their last Report, say:—"The inspectors who refer to the question of compulsory education express themselves, without exception, as favourable to the principle of it." This is rather inexact. Mr. Byrne (p. 41) reports, after referring to the growing feeling amongst farm labourers in favour of education, "If the very humblest of farm labourers already counts schooling as among the things he cannot do without, there is yet hope that, in course of time, education may become

virtually compulsory without the need of any legislative enactments." Mr. Du Pock (p. 82) writes :—"Of compulsory education as insisting upon parents sending their children to school under certain penalties, I have rarely found an advocate among either country gentry or country clergy. I have sometimes found a disposition to approve of a law by which indirect compulsion would be brought to bear upon parents, in the form of a prohibition of their children being engaged in actual agricultural labour before some fixed age, unless they have passed some standard of examination in elementary subjects before one of Her Majesty's inspectors." Indeed, this seems to be the principle of indirect compulsion which some other inspectors recommend. And Mr. Mitchell (p. 140) writes :—"Build your schools, establish your masters, provide your appliances, let these have their full play ; let the parents, nay, even the children themselves, observe the benefits to be derived from education properly conducted, and your schools will fill. All good schools are filled with scholars, and, if not quite self-supporting, are nearly so. Your success will then relieve you of the necessity for any general compulsory act. Having thus sifted the corn from the chaff, it will become more easy to apply compulsion on the idle, the indifferent, the licentious, the base, and the criminal. To pass a law which includes the respectable and the disreputable, the active and the industrious with the dissolute and worthless, is an insult to the former."

Circumstanced as we are, our care should evidently be to do nothing which may overthrow or injure the great system of education already working well, but to introduce such measures as are necessary to extend its benefits to the whole country, and, as far as we can, to increase its efficiency.

Mr. Stokes makes some valuable suggestions as to the means by which the benefits of the existing schools may be extended to classes now excluded from them. Our space compels us merely to refer to them (p. 323). There is also a valuable suggestion that in many instances women might be employed as teachers instead of men. This we think specially likely to be useful in Catholic schools. An inspector reports that this change is rapidly spreading, and has been found to answer in the United States as well as in England. "A good mistress is better than a bad master, and a good mistress may be had for the salary usually paid to an inferior master" (p. 175).

An inspector reports that injury has arisen from the "hard-and-fast line which allows no child to be presented for examination who has attended less than 200 times." He proposes to substitute for this twenty-four times. We have no doubt good would result from the change. We have selected only a few out of many practical suggestions as examples of the means by which our present system might easily be made more effective.

We are glad to observe Mr. Stokes reporting: "Schoolmasters are growing more content with their position and prospects. The laborious and efficient men find that payment by results tends to increase their credit and their pay. Some who were scared away in the panic are returning to the employment of teaching. More lads offer themselves for apprenticeship as pupil-teachers; in short, the many and considerable advantages of the teacher's lot begin to reassert their influence." We would hope that their worldly prospects may be still further improved both by further expansion of Government aid, by co-operation amongst themselves, and by material encouragement from others to provide by special insurance annuities for teachers in old age. The last report of the Committee of Council expresses the opinion that "the want of some provision by the masters themselves for sickness and old age is a matter deserving the serious consideration of the Government."

In closing these volumes, we are forcibly struck with one consideration. We who desire to defend and perfect the existing system of education, have an immense advantage in the fact that what we urge is in exact accordance with the national feelings, habits, and, we will add, prejudices of Englishmen. It has grown up like most of our institutions, no one very well knew how. Men who wished to introduce other systems found themselves obliged to fall by degrees into this and to content themselves with it, because the English people with whom they had to do would have nothing else. Thus in the course of thirty or forty years it has fallen so well into its place among English institutions, and jolted in so firmly among them as the machine of English administration made its way over somewhat rough roads, that it could not now be removed without giving a shock to our whole system. Nothing can be more in keeping with our whole polity than a great system which has thus grown up, because in one place after another it was found to "work well," although it might not be easy to have laid down beforehand the theory on which it is built. Our opponents, on the contrary, are proposing to overthrow institutions for the education of the poor, which have been the natural result of our own experience, and instead of them apply all at once to every part of England, town and country alike, a system never yet tried in England, and which, in foreign nations where it has been tried, was adopted on mere theory, and has in every one of them broken down in practice. And this system is one at first sight inconsistent with all our habits, institutions, and maxims. For instance, they are undertaking to persuade a nation whose boast is, that "an Englishman's house is his castle," and that the word "home" is peculiar to their language, that the education of children belongs not to their parents but to the State. If Catholics are defeated in a struggle which they begin with such advantages, it will certainly be their own fault.

ART. II.—ROME.

Le Parfum de Rome. Par LOUIS VEUILLOT. Paris : Gaume Frères.

THE unity which runs through all God's dealings with mankind may be said to have its centre in two cities of the earth, Jerusalem and Rome. They are both God's cities, the "cities of the Great King," His "holy mountains." The one founded by the Most High Himself, but cast away by Him because it knew not the hour of its visitation; the other conquered from the grasp of the "Prince of this world," and made holy to God and to His Christ. Jerusalem and Rome sum up within themselves the destinies of man. What can be more touching than the language of human affection in which the passionless and changeless God deigns to clothe the revelation of His election and reprobation of Jerusalem, even before He had taken upon Himself the nature of man, and stood in her streets, and taught in her temple? And when He came in the flesh, and stood upon the Mount of Olives, and looked down upon Jerusalem, how unutterably tender is the compassion of the human tears which He shed over the city of His love!

But marvellous as was the love of God for Jerusalem, until she forced Him by her own self-willed blindness and ingratitude to leave her, it is even more marvellous to think of the relation in which she stood both to God and man. She was the throne of the Majesty of the Uncreated, the dwelling-place of the God of Israel, the one only city on the whole earth which the true God could call His own, the "city of perfect beauty, the joy of all the earth." From everlasting God had chosen her to be the type not only of His bride, His spotless one, His future Church, both militant on earth and triumphant in heaven, but of every human soul espoused by Him in the mystical nuptials of His grace. Jerusalem was the one beacon-light in the world-wide ocean of darkness and error, until He Who is the "true light which enlighteneth every man who cometh into the world" came down from heaven, and the knowledge of the Lord began to cover the earth as the "covering waters of the sea." She was the seat of truth, for in her alone was the temple and priesthood of the living God. She was the well-spring of all light, and hope, and peace, and forgiveness, and love, and joy, and rest, so far as these could exist on earth, until He appeared in Whom

their fulness dwelt ; for she treasured up within herself the oracles of God, and shadowed forth the destinies of man.

But Jerusalem was unworthy of so much love. When God became incarnate, He came to enlighten and ennoble Jerusalem still more by establishing within her walls the substance of all those glories of which she herself had been the shadow. But her heart was lifted up in her pride, because her works were evil ; and she preferred her own light to the light of life, and her own shadow to His substance ; and she crucified the Lord of Glory. Then Jerusalem was in her turn destroyed, and her light put out for ever ; and not a stone of her temple or her palaces was left upon a stone. Jerusalem was destroyed ; and the narrow circle of God's revelation, the centre of which had hitherto been within her walls, grew wider and wider until it began to take in the whole world in its embrace. The prophet Jeremias had foretold that God would turn His back upon Jerusalem in the hour of her destruction ; and so it came to pass even to the letter, if we may believe the old tradition which tells us that the Son of God was crucified with His back turned to the doomed city, and His face looking to the West.

It was in the West that the new city of God was to arise. The truth of God, indeed, was no longer to be confined to a single city or people of the earth ; and the time had passed for ever that men could adore the Father in Jerusalem alone. The revelation of the new covenant was destined to embrace all nations, and tribes, and peoples, and tongues, and to teach them to adore the Father in spirit and in truth. But the kingdom of Christ, although not of this world, was still *in* the world ; and by reason of its world-wide extent had need of a fixed centre and seat of government, in order that its marvellous unity, which was to be the very proof of its divine origin, might be maintained for ever amid the shifting vicissitudes and changing conditions of the world's existence. And therefore, in the unity of God's providence, which is the source of all unity, it was still a city of the earth, in which He was to carry on, and complete, and perfect the destinies of a regenerated world, by "reconciling all things to Himself, whether in Heaven or on earth, visible or invisible, until we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ." It has ever been God's way in His work of the world's redemption to make use of the very things which Satan had used for its overthrow. It was a woman which gave to man the fruit of destruction, and desolation, and death ; it is a woman who gives to him the fruit of

salvation, restoration, and life. It was by a tree that Satan overcame; it is by a tree that He is conquered. S. Cyril of Jerusalem* tells us, that because the devil made idols of images in the human form, God took Himself the form of man, and Christ became the substantial image of God; for "by those very weapons have we been saved by which the devil was used to vanquish us." Even the things, sometimes the very places which have been either the instruments or the scenes of the sins of men, are made in God's overruling Providence not only the instruments of their punishment, but the very means of their sanctification, the steps by which they rise to that place in His kingdom of grace, to which He Himself has predestined them from eternity. What more fitting city, then, could be found for the capital of Christ's kingdom than that mighty city "which had kingdom over the kings of the earth"? What more glorious victory for the cross than to conquer to itself the seat of Satan, and to crown Christ king on the throne of the "Prince of this world," "that where sin had abounded, grace might much more abound"? What city was like to that city which was clothed with fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and was gilt with gold, and precious stones and pearls, "with its merchandise of thyne wood, and all manner of vessels of ivory, and all manner of vessels of precious stones, and of brass, and of iron, and of marble, and of cinnamon, and of odours, and ointment, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and *souls of men*"? What a triumph for the blood of the Lamb to wash away the sins of that great city "full of the names of blasphemy," which had "a cup in her hand full of the filthiness of her fornication," and on her forehead a name written: "A Mystery! Babylon the Great, the Mother of the Abominations of the Earth!"

What a masterpiece of redeeming and transforming love, not only to wash away the sins of the "great harlot who sitteth upon many waters," but to make her clean and white, and to clothe her in white garments, and to purify the golden cup in her hands, and to fill it with the red drops of His Redeeming Blood, and to offer it to the Eternal Father for the healing of the nations which had been "made drunk with the wine of her whoredom," and to make her the city of the Bride of Christ! What "revenge of recompense" to suffer the blood of all that multitude of martyrs, which no man can number, and whose souls were crying from

* Catech. Lect. xii.

beneath the altar for vengeance upon her sins to fall upon the marble of her palaces and flow through her streets, and to sanctify her gold and precious stones and pearls, and the souls of men, and to make them holy to God and to His Christ, and to change the purple and scarlet of her empire into the violet of humility, and the "vesture dipped in blood" of the love which is stronger than death, and to take them for the glorious apparel of the Princes of Christ's ever-suffering but still triumphant Church!

God spake the word, and in His own time it was done. "Rejoice over her, thou Heaven, and ye Holy Apostles and Prophets, for God hath judged your judgment on her. And there were great voices in heaven, saying:—The kingdom of this world is become Our Lord's and His Christ's, and He shall reign for ever and ever. Amen."

No greater miracle has ever been wrought in proof of Christ's faith than the conversion of pagan Rome. It was God's own doing, and it is wonderful in our eyes. It was the fulfilment of the dream of the Great Chaldean king in the earlier Babylon. It was the iron, and clay, and brass, and silver, and gold of the world's empire broken in pieces by the stone cut out of the mountain of God without hands, and becoming "like the chaff of a summer threshing-floor as it is carried away by the wind." But the stone, the rock of Peter, cut out of the rock of ages, becomes itself a great mountain, and fills the whole earth. Little did that proud old Roman world dream of the power of the folly of the Cross, as it saw the old Religion of the God of Israel with its golden candlestick and the ark of the elder Covenant pass away for ever through the Arch of Titus. Still less did it foresee that within a few hundred years, surrounded by its own victorious eagles, the Cross itself would pass in triumph beneath the Arch of Constantine. Little had men thought in the early days of Nero, as they watched some long procession sweeping past the Forum, and winding along the Via Sacra to the Capitol, that, yet a very little while, and not a stone's throw from there, one "who was himself a Roman citizen" and "free born," but a "prisoner of Christ," would take the imagery of the triumph of a Roman general and apply it to the triumph of Him who "led captivity captive," and "sat down at the right hand of God in the heavenly places above all principality, and power, and virtue, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come,—*despoiling the principalities and powers, and leading them confidently in show, and triumphing over them openly in himself.*" Little did they

imagine that the shield, and the breastplate, and the helmet, and the sword, and the girt-up loins of the Roman soldier would be made to typify the whole "armour of God"; the "shield of faith," the "breastplate of justice," the "helmet of salvation," the "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," the "loins girt up with truth" of the warrior of Christ. Little thought had they then of Paul of Tarsus. And while Nero held his court in his golden house upon the Palatine, and enthroned the sin of the cities of the plain with sacred rite and priestly benediction in the very heart of Rome, little did men think that the day would ever come when the faith of the fisherman of Galilee and the tent-maker of Tarsus would be seated on the Cæsars' throne, and that the gods of Paganism would lie broken at its feet. Yet even then the blessed feet of Peter were at the gates of Rome, and the vessel which bore the Apostle of the Gentiles rode over the blue waters of the Bay of Puteoli.

Rome became the city of God, the throne of the Vicar of His Son. The letters of her old name were reversed. Roma became Amor, and strength was made perfect in love. The kingdom of God, which had been taken from Jerusalem, was "given to a nation yielding the fruits thereof."

And as the conversion of Rome was God's work, so has Rome ever remained full of God's presence. There have been times indeed when that presence has been driven out, and the Vicar of Christ forced into exile by the spirit of lawlessness, and then Rome has almost looked like Babylon. If we remember rightly, Dr. Newman has remarked in one of his works, written even while he was yet a Protestant, that it is the presence of the Catholic Church in Rome which alone prevents it from becoming Babylon. The thought is full of truth, and opens up to us the depth of that abyss of ruin which yawns beneath the Holy City whenever the presence of God and of His Vicar is taken from it, but which, in the awfulness of its full reality, is reserved for the hour of the world's great apostasy, when the man of sin shall be revealed "showing himself in the temple of God, as if he were God." It is a thought which may well make us gather closer round S. Peter's throne, whenever it is threatened, for it is in keeping with the old belief—old even when Rome was young—that Rome and the world stand or fall together.

There have been other times (alas! that it should have been so) when the presence of God, although not driven away from Rome, has been so overclouded and overshadowed by the evil lives of those who have lived within its walls, and sometimes even sat in its high places, that men have not always been

able to see its glory or rejoice in the fulness of its light. Not that the light of God's presence in His Church can ever fail, or that her Master's words can ever be said of her: "If the light which is in you be darkness, how great is that darkness." But the brightness of her glory is darkened or hidden when, by God's permission, the clouds which mark the presence of the evil one, are hanging over Rome, or when the abomination of desolation is standing in the Holy Place.

Yet with these almost necessary exceptions (for it must needs be that scandals come) Rome has been ever full of the presence and power of God. It is this holy presence—a presence which may be felt—which throws round her that indefinable charm, which every Catholic feels on his first visit to the Holy City. This too is the secret of that inexhaustible freshness and ever new interest which hangs over the name of Rome. Like the Holy Scriptures themselves, and everything in which God speaks to man, Rome is at the same time old, and yet always new; unchanging, and yet full of variety. It may be looked at in countless different ways; it is suggestive of unnumbered hidden meanings, yet its interpretation involves no contradiction, and everything becomes clear in the light and unity of God's abiding presence. Like the pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire in which the Lord of old went before His people, that He might be the guide of their journey both by day and night; so too is His presence ever hanging over the Holy City of the new covenant in the daytime of the Church's triumph, or in the dark night of her persecution. Thus it sometimes happens that a visit to Rome exercises an almost sacramental influence over a man's life. Father Faber used to say that no man ever left Rome exactly as he entered it, but either better or worse in the sight of God and His holy angels. And the reason is because Rome is so full of God. The Church of the living God lives over again in herself, and in her children the life of her Divine Lord from year to year, and from festival to festival. She has no other life than His, Who is Himself life, and Whose life is the light of men. And nowhere is the Church's life so perfectly carried out as in Rome. God breathes through her ceremonies, His attributes are shadowed forth in her institutions, and we may almost say, as the great apostle once said of himself, that it is not so much Rome who lives, as Christ Who lives in her.

Even independently of this sacred presence there is the charm which Rome possesses in the memory of her bygone majesty in the natural order, when she held the dominion of the world; all the more touching because it speaks to us from

the ruined temple, or the broken arch, or the silent amphitheatre, or the deserted bath. Countless as are the works which her glories have inspired, yet we never weary of the subject. History and poetry, and art have found in Rome the richest of their treasure-houses; yet her resources have never been exhausted, and the latest pilgrim to her shrines can still draw forth from her secret chambers "old things and new." Goethe has said that Rome is a world in itself, apart from the material world, and that without Rome the world would be a desert. But this charm of the mere natural order she shares in common, although to a far higher degree, with Athens, and Babylon, and Nineveh, and other great cities which have left their mark upon the history of man. It is, as M. Veillot remarks (the title of whose beautiful work we have prefixed to this article), but the "coarse outer covering" which surrounds her, and which affects the natural man. The true Rome lies beneath: that Rome whose greatness has never passed away; not "childless and crownless" (as the poet sings), but who is still the crowned mistress of the world, the Rome of our souls and of our hearts, the Rome of the Vicars of the Son of Mary, the throne of S. Peter, the city of the Living God, and the Mother of Mankind!

Who would ever speak of Rome (says M. Veillot) in the same careless way as he might speak of Berlin, or London, or even Paris? Rome must always excite either immense hatred or immense love, and remain without an equal in the eyes of men. Rome triumphant, the mistress of the nations! She rules either for God or for Satan, but rule she must. At one time she has her foot upon the world, and crushes it; at another she lifts up the world and raises it to God.

It is Rome who has subjected the earth to herself, and fed upon the flesh and blood of mankind. It is Rome who has taken the human race in her arms, like a sick child, and made it to breathe the pure air of the mountains of God, and nourished it with the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ, the Living God.

When I saw Rome for the first time, before even I knew that I brought nothing into it but death, and still farther off from the knowledge that I should find in it life; without as yet knowing anything either of death or life, but moved by a higher instinct than my own; when, I say, I saw this august Rome, and had breathed her indefinable fragrance, then I knew that love was within my power and within my reach.

What, then, was this fragrance which penetrated my soul without passing through my senses; which, while it seemed within me to be both a language and a light, seemed also to close my eyes and my ears to all that was going on around me?

This fragrance was as it were a vesture of God, which, while it concealed Him, bore witness to His presence; and I followed upon the traces of this

fragrance without knowing what it was, hesitating, and yet overpowered ; and I went out of the way in which I had hitherto walked to follow it, and soon I came to know that it was a real language that I had heard. It was the language of Rome, and at the same time the Word of God. And in this fragrance, and language, and light, I found what I had not looked for and had never known,—God, Rome, and myself.*

Never, perhaps, has this fragrance of Rome, this “ odour of sweetness,” this “ good odour ” of Christ been more sensible, this “ vesture of God ” more visible, than in these days in which we live. Happy they who can inhale this fragrance, happy the eyes which can see God’s presence in eternal Rome ; for even if not within the threshold, they are already within the outer court of “ that old Church which is before all time and which will fill all time, and after all time will still live on to fill eternity.” Most happy they who not only see and feel it, but who realize and understand it, for they have already entered the inner courts and the Holy Place of the “ Temple not made with hands.” Never, perhaps, has there been a time when the language of Rome has been so divine, or when she has spoken to us so much or so grandly about God. Never has there been a time when Rome has stood out more clearly among the cities of the world in her sublime mission of evangelist of the nations, and maintainer of the principles of eternal justice ; for it is there alone that the Gospel of Christ, which, if not openly rejected, is at least disregarded and insulted by the rulers and governments of the world, may be said to be still enthroned, and that its principles and laws are still observed in all their plenitude. In these our days, when governments have ceased to be distinctly and outwardly Christian, and have separated themselves from the Church, and cut themselves off from her influence—when the faith and law of Christ are no longer the basis of politics or the groundwork of national constitutions,—Rome is the only witness left in all the world to the great truth, that He who “ has washed us from our sins ” is also the “ Prince of the kings of the earth.” It is from Rome alone that the voice of warning has gone forth to the nations, telling them of the danger of the gulf which lies beneath them, and into which they must too surely fall at last, if, trusting to their own strength and wisdom, they think themselves sufficient for themselves, and reject her guiding hand, who is herself the mother of the nations and the life of the world. Loud, and angry, and scornful was the outcry with which the

* Vol. i. pp. 2—9.

Syllabus of Pius IX. was received by men; but generations yet unborn may live to date their salvation from that eventful Act, and to bless the Pontiff whom God has raised up to recall the world from its downward course to ruin into the "old paths and the good way" which lead to life. At the present moment (we can say it without exaggeration), Rome is the *one* city of the world which is ruled entirely by the law of Christ, the one spot of earth which is still true to the responsibilities of the "Faith which was once delivered to the Saints." In Rome even the stones cry out; and the obelisk of the Vatican, in front of the threshold of the Apostles, whose shadow perhaps may have fallen upon Mary's exiled child as He entered the land of Egypt, and made the idols to fall upon their faces, tells no lie to heaven when it proclaims that in Rome at least Christ has conquered, and reigns and rules. *Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus regit! Vicit Leo de tribu Juda!* And yet there are men who would take away this little spot of earth from Christ, this remnant of His vineyard, this one loyal city of the Cross; who would throw down the throne of the Vicar of the King of kings, and tear away the crown from his brow in order to satisfy the cravings of a false and narrow nationalism which is ever at variance with the Catholicity of Christ's kingdom upon earth, and to build upon the ruins of the Apostolic throne the godless government and corrupt civilization of an age which is too wrapt in itself to remember God, too jealous of its own interests to respect those of Christ, and thus to complete the guilt and ruin of a well-nigh apostate world! Multiply all the real and undoubted abuses of the temporal sovereignty as you will; add to them all the calumnies which have been heaped upon the Government of the Holy See by the traitors who have betrayed it, or the enemies who have belied it; suppose them to be as true as we know them to be false, and we still maintain that to destroy or even to weaken the throne of Peter would be to destroy and weaken the foundations of all authority upon earth; for, alone among the thrones of the world, it rests upon the eternal principle that Christ "is the King of kings and Lord of lords."

And shall God suffer this to be? If so, then are we already at the "beginning of sorrows," and our hearts may well fail us for fear of those things that are coming upon the earth; for then assuredly the day is at hand of which our Lord has said: "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find, think you, faith on earth?" And yet how often in the history of the Papacy have there been foreshadowings of Anti-Christ and of the last woes, and still their fulfilment has been mercifully delayed?

S. Gregory the Great thought in his day that the last hour had come. All the world was in ruin ; pestilence, and earthquake, and famine, were busy at their work. His own soul (says M. Veuillot*) seemed to be the only healthy thing belonging to mankind. Yet Gregory may be almost said to be the founder of Christian Europe, and the end was not yet. What has been may be again. God may have yet higher destinies in store for the race of man. Rather let us believe that although governments have ceased to be Christian, and society has divorced herself from the ties which bound her to the Church, the Gospel, which at the beginning went forth from Rome to the ends of the earth, has but gathered itself back again into the citadel of its strength, and that it is waiting there in patience, keeping justice alive in the world (and liberty, too, if men would only know it), until the present phase of Christendom, with its idolatry of gold and its revival of Pagan luxury, shall have melted away, when it will again issue forth in streams of light and true civilization to replenish the face of the earth, and make all things new.

Many are the ways in which Rome speaks to us of God, and proclaims herself His city, and in which the fragrance of His presence, which, like the incense of her churches, clings to her walls, and cannot be dispersed, becomes sensible to our notice.

One of the first things which strike and almost startle a visitor to Rome, is to find how familiarly the realities of faith and the mysteries of the unseen world enter into the course of men's daily life. At Rome God seems to take the first place in the thoughts of men, and the world the second ; and (unlike, indeed, what is to be seen in other cities of the world) men really take Christ at His blessed word, and seek first the kingdom of God and its justice, believing, because He has said it, that "all other things shall be added unto them." How entirely has modern society banished from itself the idea of the supernatural, and of the world to come ! It has no higher life than that of this world. The world is its God, and to succeed in it is its religion. It has lost all idea of Christ's kingdom, and grows angry and indignant if we say that Christ has any rights or any interests in this world, or fretful and impatient whenever it comes across the Church. Ever anxious that the Church should be kept within her own sphere, it has no scruple about tyrannizing over her, and usurping her prerogatives ; so it substitutes the interests of the nationalities of this world for the glorious liberties of the

* Vol. i. p. 122.

Church of God. It deprives the Church of every influence, and seeks thus to banish God from the world. Even when it is seized with a fit of liberality, and talks to us of a "free Church in a free State," it only means that the liberty is to be all on one side, and in favour of the State; for it will not hear of the Church having any laws which may interfere with its own liberty, or lie out of its power to abrogate. And yet, unless God is really to be banished from His own world, His Church, through which He speaks, ought surely to have a directing voice in every province of human thought and action. Modern society lives for this world, labours for this world, sins for this world. It brings up its children for this world alone, by teaching them that the one great thing they have to learn is to succeed in this life, rather than so to live that one day they may be made citizens of that "city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Oh, how the angels must weep at that mockery of teaching which we call modern education! and what a lifting up of hands by children against their parents will there be at the last day before the great white throne, for having taught them to place this world before the next, and to risk eternity for time, and (oh, the madness!) for having *not* taught them the one thing for which they were sent into the world. In a word, men give their health, and wealth, and strength, and time to this world. They spend and are spent in the service of temporal things rather than of those which are eternal.

But at Rome the opposite of all this is witnessed. We have already seen how the kingdom of Christ, with its laws and principles, are regarded at Rome as the foundation of the government of the State. The same may now be said with regard to that of the family. To live and act upon higher principles than those of this world seems there to be the rule rather than the exception. Men seem to believe, and to act upon the belief, that they have not been sent into the world merely to make it better, or richer, or more powerful, or even happier than it is; although at the same time (as we said above) they seem to know that zeal for the kingdom of God will really make the world happier, and better, and richer, and more powerful, in accordance with His promise Whose Word can never pass away. And so religion at Rome is not an external thing which may be put off or on, and which sometimes does not fit; but it enters into men's being, and into the actions of their daily and even hourly life.

Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in the education of the Roman youth. All who have lived for any length of time in Rome, who have mixed in its society, and have become

familiar with its middle and lower classes, will bear witness to the truth of these remarks, whatever other objections they may be inclined to find with modern Roman education. And, what is more, the enemies of God's Church know it also. They have found out that Rome's education of her children is one of the strongest of her outworks; and they think that if it could be once taken or destroyed by the corruption of the Roman youth, they need not fear much about the rest. To what a depth of corruption they would bring them if they could, may be seen in what they have already done in the Romagna and Southern Italy, where, with a policy worthy of the evil one, publications reeking with impurity and blasphemy, in which the foulest crimes are attributed to the clergy, and even to the Holy Father himself, are forced upon a boy's notice at almost every bookstall, or thrust into his hand at the corner of the street, or even at the very gates of the University and College.

There is one special characteristic of the inhabitants of Rome, which, springing as it does from the religion and education of her children, we cannot here forget to mention. We allude to that realization of God's presence and providence, and resignation to His holy will, which is so conspicuous in all ranks of the Roman people. We may remember how, a quarter of a century ago, the honest mind of Dr. Arnold was deeply affected by the touching appeals to God's presence which are to be found inscribed in so many places on the walls of Rome, and how he thought that a people thus mindful of God could not be dead in Christ. And this realization of their faith is apparent even on the surface of their conversations. If asked about their health, *Ringraziamo Iddio* is the answer alike of the noble as of the peasant. *Se Dio vuole; Sia fatta la Sua Santissima Volontà!* Such are the constant familiar expressions of every mouth. How often have we been charmed and edified by the simple, childlike confidence and grace with which the Roman "*vignajuolo*" lifts his hat from his head at the mention of the Holy Name, in speaking of the unknown future which is yet in the hands of God, or of some past visitation of His justice or mercy.

One day the abbot of Solesmes and a monk of S. Paul's (the story is M. Veuillot's)* went to visit the tomb of the Scipios, when they were overtaken by the rain. They took shelter in a shed, and recited their Breviary until the rain should be over. A poor old woman, who had also taken shelter in the same place, watched them respectfully while

* Vol. ii. p. 242.

they prayed; nor did she interrupt them until they had finished the last words of the *Te Deum*. Then, turning to them, she said: *Signori, che bella parola: Domine in te speravi, non confundar in æternum!* And after a salutation worthy of a noble lady, she placed her bundle on her head and went away.

As in Rome God seems to take the first place in the thoughts of men, so too the best of everything is given to God. All that the riches, and splendour, and beauty of the world can give—gold, and silver, and precious stones, sweet-smelling gums, and many-coloured flowers—all that is brightest and choicest, and most beautiful—all that in other cities men have taken from Him for their own uses, and even for their own sins—all these things are given back by Rome to their Creator, and are lavished on His shrines; whilst she adds to them, as her offerings, the noblest of the creations with which she herself, inspired by Him, has in her turn inspired the intellect, and taste, and imagination of her children. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Another way in which Rome appears to the visitor as God's city is in its open, public recognition of the kingship of His Son. In Rome we see and feel that Christ is King, and that His royalty is recognized. In other capitals of the world it is the birth, or the coronation of the earthly king, or the festival of the constitution which is celebrated on national holidays with general rejoicing, and public ceremonies, and military reviews, and brilliant illuminations. Or, on the other hand, it is the death of the sovereign, or some national calamity, which is made the occasion of public mourning. But in Rome the King is Christ, and the Holy City keeps her public rejoicings for the Birthday and Resurrection, and her mourning for the Passion and Death of the Great King. Who that has spent the Holy Week in Rome, and has seen the soldiers pass through the streets with muffled drums and arms reversed during the Triduo of the Passion, or has witnessed on the evening of Easter Day the transformation of S. Peter's from the reality of its massive grandeur into the fairy-like proportions of a palace of light, while its vast dome seems to be suspended in the air like a tiara of fire surmounted by a cross of glory, or has watched how the whole city—piazza and street, the palace of the Roman prince and the lowly dwelling in *Trastevere*—bursts into a blaze of splendour, and has not felt that both her mourning and her rejoicing are nothing less than Rome's acts of faith in the Passion, and Death, and Resurrection of the Redeemer of the world?

Nowhere is Rome more loyal to the Son of God than in

her devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. Indeed, she may be said to be the city of the Blessed Sacrament, Its tabernacle and throne. In Rome Its worship is perpetual, unbroken even by a moment's pause; and so scrupulously is this provided for by her anxious love, that the deposition of the Sacred Host is not allowed to take place in one church until after it has been elevated in another. At the beginning of the Church's year, on Advent Sunday, the Lamb of God is lifted up on His Sacramental Throne by His own Vicar's hands, in the Cappella Paolina at the Vatican, and from thence the Blessed Presence passes from Basilica to Church, and from Church to Convent, until well nigh all Rome's holy places have been made holier by the visit of the All Holy. What a thought it is! He Who gave strength to Peter, and conversion to Paul, and purity to Agnes, and victory to all Rome's saints, comes now during that year of ceaseless worship, and rests for forty hours with unspeakable complacency on their glorious shrines! And not an hour of day or night but the poorest, and lowliest, and most forgotten of Rome's children can have audience of the King of Heaven in the city of His saints! Not a morning but the sun rises upon countless altars, upon which the Lamb of God is lying, as it were, slain, and at which God and man are being brought together in His Kiss of Peace; not an evening in which the sun sinks in glory beneath the western heaven, but the Sun of Justice, which never sets, casts His silent benediction upon kneeling crowds! And He who would have gathered Jerusalem's now scattered children, even as the hen doth her brood, gathers now at Rome the children of her who was once the "Great Harlot," under the shadow of His wings! "Surely many are the children of the desolate, more than of her who hath a husband, saith the Lord. All thy children shall be taught of Him, and great shall be the peace of thy children. No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper, and every tongue that resisteth thee in judgment thou shalt condemn."

But this is not all. The mystical life of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament is not only the life and light of men, it is also the worship of the Eternal Father. What would the world be, were there not here and there on the face of the round earth, which in the beginning God created very good, and which in the midst of time He redeemed with His own blood, amidst all the idolatries, and murders, and covetousness, and lusts of its inhabitants, some little spots of sinlessness, and purity, and peace, where the eye of the Everlasting Father can look upon the face of His Christ? Yet

where on earth amongst all His creatures, even among His own elected saints, can God look for perfect worship, save in the tabernacles of His altars, and on the thrones of the Blessed Sacrament? But at Rome Christ is ever on His throne, the "Lamb, standing, as it were, slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God, sent forth into all the earth," pleading with His five wounds for all the sons of men, and for the wants of His Vicar and His Church. It is the worship of heaven begun on earth, the vision of the isle of Patmos fulfilled in Rome!

And this was once Nero's Rome, which was "drunk with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," and "the mother of the abominations of the earth." Now, indeed, we can understand why God has left, side by side with the Christian city, in such startling contrast, the ruins of the temples and palaces of old Rome, that men may know that He alone, the Lord, hath done it, and that where "sin has abounded, grace doth much more abound!"

Our picture of Rome's devotion to the Blessed Sacrament would be incomplete were we to pass over the way in which It is received whenever It is carried through the streets. Few indeed are the large cities (and they are growing fewer) in these days, in which the Son of God can come into the streets without danger of insult and desecration. Once a year at most, in these evil times, can His priests take Him in their arms, and carry Him in triumph through His people, that His shadow passing over them may heal them of their sins, and cool their passions, and give strength to their souls, while children cast bright flowers beneath His feet, and burn sweet incense before His presence (poor triumph, indeed, it is true, but triumph still); and then it is oftener round the village green than in the crowded city. Even in some Catholic lands, when He is carried to the bedside of the sick and dying, and when surely more than at other times He might look for some grateful recognition of His presence, it is oftener in secret and in silence, than with the triumph of believing love. Sometimes it is as a proscribed outcast in His own world that He passes on His visits of mercy and forgiveness; and His priests, instead of being able to assert His rights, are too often obliged to apologize for His presence in the streets. But at Rome the angels are ever looking down upon the triumph of the Blessed Sacrament.

We do not speak now of the procession of *Corpus Domini*, in which He, the Great High Priest, is borne in His Pontiff's arms with all the emblems of sovereign state, round the Colonnade and Piazza of S. Peter's into the great Basilica; nor of

those other processions by which every part, and almost every street of Rome, is blessed by His saving presence ; for these are the organized expressions of Rome's devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. It is rather to the natural, uncalled for, spontaneous welcome with which It is received by all classes of the Roman people, whenever It is carried through the streets to the sick and dying, that we more especially refer. We will place one of these scenes before our readers.

The stranger, perhaps, is returning slowly homeward through one of the narrow streets of the city. The Ave Maria has been rung by the bells of all the churches, and the shadows of evening are falling fast upon the old houses, while their occupants, after the labour and heat of the day, are sitting or standing, singing or conversing at their several doorways, or, perhaps are gathered in little groups round the neighbouring "*Friggitoria*," where the brightly burning fire lights up the ever-varying expression of their Italian faces. Suddenly the sound of a distant bell falls upon the ear, and in the distance lighted torches are seen somewhat hurriedly approaching, while the murmur of many voices joined in prayer is borne upon the evening air. Instantly a hush falls upon the street, while the cry, "*Il Santissimo! il Santissimo!*" passes from mouth to mouth. Lamps of that old classic shape of which the Romans are still so fond, are snatched off the tables by those who may be still remaining in the house ; and thus the whole street becomes spontaneously illuminated in honour of the Divine Majesty Which is passing by. All carriages, even of those of the highest rank, are stopped, and their occupants dismount, and either kneel upon the ground, or fall into the ranks of those who are following the little procession, with uncovered heads, to the sick-bed of the sufferer. In Rome all men are subjects of the Great King. Perhaps some cardinal (sometimes it may be the Sovereign Pontiff) has met the procession, as he is returning from his evening drive, and himself takes the Blessed Sacrament from the parish priest, and administers it with his own hands to the dying man. Rapidly, but reverently, the Sacred Host is borne along (for not a moment, perhaps, is to be lost), amid the kneeling crowd, while prayerful mothers hold up their smiling little ones to catch *His* smile. The house of the sick man is reached at last, and while a few enter with the priest to join in the responses of the Ritual, the crowd remains kneeling in the street, reciting the Litany of the Dying or the Rosary of the Mother of God. Then, when the absolving words have been spoken, and the Bread of Life given for the last time, the little procession is reformed, the priest, as he

leaves the house, entones the *Te Deum*, and the Hymn of Praise is taken up by those who are still kneeling in the street. And He who has just taken away the sins of that dying man is borne back in triumph to the tabernacle of His silent love. The crowd still follows, and is joined by the inhabitants of the neighbouring streets, who by this time have heard of the visit of the Most Holy, and who will not go away until they too have received His blessing. The lamps are again held out of the windows, the street again illuminated, until the church is reached from whence He came. Then in a moment the sacred building is filled by the people in every part, and as the priest takes Him in his arms, as Simeon did of old, and blesses them, there bursts forth from the kneeling crowd, in their own Italian tongue, a cry of thanksgiving and adoration, again and again repeated:—

O vivo Pan' del Ciel',
Gran Sacramento !

And how many heads that night rest the lighter on their pillows for the silent benediction of Mary's Son ! May the day never come when such scenes shall cease in Rome, or the Roman people be ashamed of God's Presence in their streets !

But we must look at our subject in yet another light. Great conquerors and great monarchs have always left their impress upon the cities which they have either conquered, or built, or restored. Their wisdom, or benevolence, or skill, the largeness of their ideas, even their very character, are reflected in the institutions and public works of the cities which they have loved so well. Sometimes it is the intellect or taste of a great people which is thus reflected. Even in their ruins, the stones of such cities speak to us of their founders. How eloquently do the winged bulls of Nineveh, or the colossal halls of Thebes, or the lonely grandeur of Palmyra, or the light and graceful capitals of Athens, or the massive amphitheatre and triumphal arch of Imperial Rome, or the sea-washed stones of Venice, still speak to us of Assyrian strength, or of Egyptian majesty, or of Zenobia's pride, or of the subtle and philosophic but "too superstitious" Greek, or of the Cæsars' victories, or of the wealth and independence of the great Republic of the Sea ! And shall God leave no impress on the city of His love ? Rather we may be sure that every institution of Christian Rome will reflect some one of His attributes, and that the very stones of her churches will cry aloud to us of Him who has left His image on the noblest of His creatures, and His impress on every work of

His hands. Speaking of the material world, Dr. Newman has remarked that "God has traced out many of His attributes upon it,—His immensity, His wisdom, His power, His loving-kindness, and His skill; but more than all, its very face is illuminated with the glory and beauty of His eternal excellence. This is that attribute in which all His attributes coalesce, which is the perfection, or (as I may say) the flower and bloom of their combination." And after having illustrated his remarks by the example of beauty among men, in which youth and health and vigour coalesce, he adds:—"This is that quality which, by the law of our nature, draws us off ourselves in admiration, which moves our affections, which wins from us a disinterested homage; and it is shed in profusion, in token of its Creator, over the visible world."*

What is true of the material world is true also, in its measure, of Rome, the city of God. He has traced upon its institutions His immensity, His power, His loving-kindness, and His skill; but, more than all, the glory of His eternal excellence, because it is the centre and throne of His Church, which (in the words of F. Faber) is a truer image of the invisible majesty of God than our faith is ordinarily allowed to perceive. "It is difficult," he says, "to make pictures of spiritual things; but it brings wonderful thoughts into our minds if we try to picture the Church to ourselves as thus outstretching itself to enclose all the attributes of the Most High."† As then, the Church is an image of God, so also Rome is an image of the Church, for both are shaped on His eternal attributes, and on both is shed in profusion, in token of their Lord, the beauty of His excellence. This is the true solution of the mystery of the fragrance of Rome. This is why the sight of Rome lifts us above ourselves, and wins our love. This is the key to the interpretation of that mysterious language which is ever speaking to our souls.

The institutions of Rome have grown up under the watchful eye of the Vicerent of the all-wise, all-powerful, all-skilful God, and the Eternal Spirit Himself has overshadowed them. And the "stream of the river of God which maketh His city joyful," like the holy waters which Ezekiel saw in vision, has issued forth from under its walls to renew the face of the earth, and "to hasten its deliverance from the servitude of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God." The institutions of Rome are not Rome

* Discourses to Mixed Congregations: the Mystery of Divine Condescension.

† Precious Blood, p. 288.

itself, although there are sometimes cases, with regard to some of them at least, in which they may become identical. They are in themselves human, while Rome, so far as she is the see of Peter, and the throne of the Vicar of Christ, is divine. It is to Peter alone, and to Rome so far as she is his, not to her institutions, that the promise of eternal indefectibility and immunity from error has been made, although (as we have said) there are cases in which certain of her institutions (as for instance, some of her Sacred Congregations) are so identified with the person of the Vicar of Christ, as to be clothed, so far as they represent him, with his authority, and thus to become identical with Rome, and to speak to us with Rome's voice. But although her institutions are not, like herself, divine, yet when we look at them as a whole, and consider their wisdom, and beauty, and variety, and world-wide adaptability to the wants of men, we feel that some One higher than man has inspired their creation, and watches over their success. In this respect the institutions of Rome resemble the Divine offices and Ritual of the Church. The order, and arrangement, and composition of her offices, and the ceremonies of her Ritual have all had their human origin; yet there is such a wonderful harmony, and justness of relative proportion, and beauty of adaptation to the ever-varying circumstances of the life of man, and (so far as the former are concerned) such an intuitive grasp of the hidden meanings of the Word of God, and so God-like a wisdom in their application to the ever-changing phases of the Church's mystical life as shown forth in the festivals of Our Lord, and His Holy Mother, and the Saints, running through them all; and they have grown up so noiselessly and imperceptibly into a unity of such perfect beauty, that we cannot help feeling that their whole result is the work of His overruling wisdom, Who "reacheth mightily from end to end, and ordereth all things sweetly,"—one of those many-coloured veils of the Sanctuary behind which He hides Himself in the operations of His love.

So also is it with the institutions of Rome. Human in their origin, they are divine in their result, veils of the Sanctuary, which, like those on the tabernacles of the Blessed Sacrament, while they conceal His presence, tell us at the same time that He is there.

We may go farther, and say that not only as a whole, but even taken singly, the institutions of Rome shadow forth to some extent the attributes of God. From the highest of the Sacred Congregations which are more immediately concerned with the government of the Universal Church, down to the

humblest brotherhood busied about works of mercy and compassion, the almost endless variety of her institutions seems not only to reflect in their great wisdom some one or other of the many-sided attributes of the All-wise Ruler of the Universe, but also to embrace the whole of mankind in the mighty sweep of their exhaustless charity, for the love of Him who, "when He was rich, for their sakes became poor, that through His poverty they might be made rich." Where, but in Rome, can we find such a concentration of that wisdom which is from above, full of good fruits? such skill in the adaptation of spiritual means to the one great end for which all things were created? Even to the natural man Rome is a wonder, while to the heretic it is a difficulty and a scandal. It is indeed true that to each unbelieving generation, during its lifetime and in its struggle with the Church, Rome and its institutions appear foolishness; for no generation can fully understand the nature of its own struggle with the Church. All her institutions are parts of one mighty whole—means towards one end; and it is only when the generation, the necessities of which have called forth these institutions, has passed away, that men begin to understand them as a whole, or grasp the end for which they have been given, by entering fully into their motive and their purpose. And it will only be when the last institution has been breathed into the Church's mind by God the Holy Ghost, and realized in outward form, that we shall be able to grasp the whole of the marvellous unity of the mystical life of Rome as developed and shown forth in her institutions, and in the spiritual life of her children. Thus it comes to pass that, although during the lifetime of each unbelieving generation the policy and institutions of Rome may seem little better than foolishness, or even the despair of an ever-losing cause, yet when the next generation comes to read the history of its predecessor, then even the "natural man" (however prejudiced he may still be as to the present) is ready to proclaim the past policy of Rome to be a masterpiece of human wisdom, while the heretic can only explain its triumphs by attributing them to the spirit of darkness, and by calling Christ Anti-Christ and the "children of the household" Beelzebub, as the Jews had long ago called their Master; thus filling up the measure of their iniquity with blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

No one who has watched the working of the Sacred Congregations of Rome can refuse to bear witness to the consummate wisdom, the enlightened knowledge, the great learning, the dexterous skill, the unwearied patience, and, above all, the delicate tact (seemingly an inborn attribute of Rome) with which the wants, and anxieties, and dangers, and

doubts, and difficulties of God's Universal Church are examined and decided by the holy and learned men who compose them; while if we give a glance at the variety of the subject-matter of their deliberations, co-extensive with the limits of the world, instead of complaining (as some have thoughtlessly done) of their slowness, we shall be filled with wonder at the immensity of their labours. "Who shall tell" (exclaims a former writer in this REVIEW who was well acquainted with their proceedings *) "of the assiduity with which they devote themselves to duties, of which upon earth they can seldom see the result or reap the glory? with what kindness and affability they receive the statements of all who apply to them, and listen to the suggestions and informations of those whose experience or local knowledge can assist their deliberations?" The erection, division, union, or suppression of the dioceses of the whole world,—the election or resignation of the bishops,—the granting of the pallium,—the investigation of questions connected with faith and morals,—the examination and punishment of heresy, blasphemy, abuse of the Sacraments, feigned sanctity, disbelief, or contempt of the Church's teaching,—the interpretation of the disciplinary decrees of the Council of Trent,—the revision of the decrees of Provincial Synods, and of appeals against them,—decisions upon the validity of marriage or of religious profession,—questions respecting the residence of parish priests, the rejection of candidates for benefices, public impediments to orders, and the duties of chapters,—the observance of the holy Ritual and ceremonies of the Church,—the canonization and beatification of the servants of God,—the extraordinary ecclesiastical affairs of countries which have been laid waste by revolution and placed in an exceptional relation to the Holy See,—the immunity of the Church from the encroachments of the civil power,—the discipline of religious orders,—the examination of the bishops of Italy and the adjacent islands,—the examination, condemnation, and proscription of wicked books,—the correction of books of the Eastern Church,—the authenticity of indulgences and relics,—the propagation of the faith among the heathen, and especially in China,—the regulation and superintendence of all Church matters of every kingdom not subject to a Catholic sovereign,—the visitation of the churches of Rome,—the care of the fabric of S. Peter's, which, as the glory of the whole world, requires a special congregation to itself,—diplomatic relations with foreign States,—the quasi-private correspondence of the Holy Father, and the preparation of allo-

* See DUBLIN REVIEW, No. LII.

cutions,—the reception and classification of innumerable memorials,—the hearing of ecclesiastical causes,—the solution of difficult cases of conscience and absolution of reserved cases,—the nominations to be made in the consistory,—the collation of abbeys, benefices, and other offices and pensions in the gift of the Holy Father,—these are some of the questions for Rome's wisdom, these are some of the labours of her work of love in her care of all the churches.

Without the Sacred Congregations (remarks the writer whom we last quoted) the Pope would not be able to receive and answer, in the course of many years, the petitions and questions which reach him in as many weeks. "Indeed, ought we not to wonder how one man can support the burthen which he bears so lovingly? *Portamus onera omnium qui gravantur*, said his predecessor S. Siricius; and how is it possible that, without support from Him Whose vicar he is, he can endure the ever-renewed labour of hearing day by day, and hour by hour, the petitions and complaints of the least as well as of the greatest of the many millions who acknowledge his paternal sway? To his throne come the last sighs of the martyrs of China, and the first lisplings of the newly-baptized natives of the South-Sea Islands; the Synods of America and the Bishops of Hungary send to him their decrees; to him the benighted children of Central Africa stretch out their hands for missionaries. To him the anxious questions which have divided the learned are referred; and when the voice of Peter, speaking through him, has been heard, all are silent, and all disputes are at an end. To him the weakest and the greatest alike turn, and each receives an answer; and full often, when the season of repose has come, he must wake up and attend to those who are knocking without, for he knows no time for rest; and even in the still midnight the Pope has gone, or has been summoned, to dispense the treasures which are in his keeping. After the great Pontiff, Benedict XIV., had received the viaticum, and when he was expecting the moment of death, he summoned the usual officers and ordered the decree approving the heroic virtues of S. Francis de Girolamo to be published."*

What mere human wisdom or human patience could bear the government of the souls of men? Where but in God's city of Rome is that burthen borne? Who but Christ's Vicar is equal to its weight?

Where, also, but in Rome can we find such an overflow of

* See DUBLIN REVIEW, No. LII.

charity, such a reflection of God's uncreated love, such an outward realization of the longings of His sacred heart, Who was anointed to make the nations of one mind upon the earth, and to preach the Gospel to the poor, and deliverance to the captive, and sight to the blind, and to heal the contrite heart, and to set at liberty them that are bruised, and to make the widow's heart sing for joy?

What a mother Rome has been to the nations of the earth! She saw them sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death, and she had compassion on them, and guided their feet into the way of peace. She gathered them under the shadow of her wings, and watched over them with unwearied care, and told them the things that were for their peace. If they had only suffered her, she would have brought them to the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ, and all good things, and true riches and real blessings she would have added unto them. Had Rome only had her way, wars would have ceased upon the earth, for she herself would have been the arbiter of the quarrels of mankind, and would have guarded with jealousy the administration of the law of nations. Then would the nations themselves—the strongest with the weakest, the greatest with the least—have been gathered in peace around her throne, and the vision of *Isaias*, the son of *Amos*, would have been fulfilled: "*Ephraim* would not have envied *Juda*, nor would *Juda* have fought against *Ephraim*. The sword would have been turned into the ploughshare, and the spear into the sickle: nation would not have lifted up sword against nation, neither would they have been exercised any more to war." Nay, she would have broken down the wall of separation between them; for it is Rome alone upon the earth who has realized the truth that "there is neither Greek nor Jew, barbarian nor Scythian," but that all are one in Christ; and there would have been one fold and one shepherd. But it was not yet to be. The nations, or some of them at least, grew tired of her gentle sway, and jealous of the sweet supremacy of the Vicar of the king of kings. There came a day when they called evil good and good evil, and put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter, and darkness for light and light for darkness; and in that day they began to hate the name of Rome. They let go her guiding hand, which had led them so faithfully along the narrow path of truth and life, and wandered, each one by itself, unguided and unblessed, far away from her into the endless wilderness of error and destruction. Yet Rome never forgot her love for the children she had born to God. Again and again she sent to look for them; again and again she sought to bring them back into

her arms. Against hope she believed in hope, and wrestled for them with God in prayer. And so it came to pass that when all was lost she began to find; when all was destroyed, and not a stone was left upon a stone, she began to build. They complained of her riches, she came to them in poverty; and now, again, after centuries of waiting, she is stealing her silent way back into the hearts of some of them, ready to begin again the renewal of the world. And so too for the sufferings of nations, who has ever felt like Rome? What friend, at this very moment, has poor bleeding and fettered Poland but the Vicar of Christ, who only the other day wept over her fate? Where now can she look for succour but to the love of Rome? Even in Catholic countries, how small is the sympathy with other sister nations of the faith when laid low by suffering or persecution! How seldom are public prayers or solemn intercession offered for their wants! But it is not so in Rome. If one nation suffer, Rome suffers with it; if one nation glory, Rome glories with it; for they are all her children, and she loves them with a mother's love.

Surely, there is no greater thing upon the earth than the Catholicity of the love of Rome.

And as for the nations of the world, so also has been her love for her own children at home. Thirty years ago it was stated in this Review that it would be impossible to name a want of man for which the love of Rome has not made provision. "To protect helpless infancy, and provide for decrepit age; to shield the innocent from temptation, and bring back the fallen from crime; to spare the blushes of ingenuous and shrinking poverty; to assist the tottering exertions of struggling merit, and repair the broken fortunes of honest but unsuccessful industry; to afford consolation and relief to the sick, the prisoner, and the dying, and secure the honours and advantages of Christian burial for the dead; such are the leading objects, branching out into a thousand details, of the comprehensive, the truly Catholic charity of Rome."*

This was literally true at the time when it was written, and thirty years have but added to the love of Rome. Who can think without pride of the twenty-two hospitals standing ever open for the relief of the suffering and sick ("as nearly perfect, we are told, as it is possible to render institutions of human origin"), where no order or recommendation from governor or subscriber is required, no question asked as to the creed or circumstances of the applicant, and no distinction

* See DUBLIN REVIEW, No. XI.

† Rome and its Institutions. By Mr. Maguire. Ch. xvi.

made except in such of them as are reserved for the use of particular trades or nations ; for Spaniards, French, Flemings, Germans, Slavonians, even Moors and Abyssinians, have or have had their hospitals at Rome. What a joy it is to turn from the sad thought of all the infanticide in England to that of the carefully tended little beds of the great foundling hospital of Santo Spirito, the most ancient in Europe ! What a relief it is to pass in thought from the cold gloom and humiliating charity and prison-like buildings of our English workhouses, to the great palace of the Ospizio Apostolico di San Michele, where education is given to the young, and shelter to the old, and employment to the idle ; where tailors, shoemakers, carpenters, weavers, sculptors, and painters are busy with their several trades, while those who have higher tastes are instructed in chemistry, anatomy, architecture, engraving, tapestry weaving, and the higher branches of learning. How pleasant it is to think of the white-clad " Orfanelli " of S. Maria in Acquiro, as they carry the little baby-dead in triumph to their graves, and of the well-nigh countless asylums and refuges of Rome ; but above all of those in which friendless and forsaken girls are kept far away from the shadow of that foul sin which defiles the streets of modern England, and are brought up in innocence and purity, and instructed in all useful domestic arts, and at last are dowered, according to their calling, either for the cloister or married life. How consoling it is to know that, over and above all these institutions, there is the office of apostolic almoner, whose duty it is not only to discover and provide for such urgent cases of distress as may not have fallen under the notice or care of the former, but also to procure medical advice and other necessities for those bashful poor who are ashamed to confess their poverty, and who are therefore visited at their own homes by deputies appointed for the purpose. And when we think of the antiquity of these institutions (most of them having been founded before the end of the fifteenth century), and remember that refuges for the houseless poor, which have only of late years found their way into England, have existed in Rome for nearly two hundred years, how is it possible to avoid the conclusion that even in the Middle Ages Rome was in advance of some of the most civilized cities of modern times in those works of charity which are the fulfilment of the royal law of Christ. " Rome (says Cardinal Morichini), the centre of that holy religion which inspires charity, gave to Europe the first and brightest examples of its practice ; and while the latter was almost entirely wrapt in darkness and barbarism, Rome
ed retreats for the indigent sick, asylums for the

widow and the maiden, institutions for the orphan and foundling; thus proving by facts that civilization is the daughter of Evangelical virtue. It was a pontiff who, in the twelfth century, opened the first foundling hospital; it was a pontiff who instituted, at the Ospizio Apostolico, the first school of arts; it was the popes, in fine, who first taught the world, by their public works, that to the able-bodied poor the best charity is employment." *

But the glory of Rome's charity is centred in her confraternities. It is not, perhaps, too much to say that even the spirit of civil association was a gift of Rome to Europe, just as the early councils and synods of the Roman Church were the germs of the Parliaments of later times. But the spirit of religious association is her own special gift. Even in the day-spring of her temporal greatness, when she shook off the dust which was still clinging to her garments from her long burial in the Catacombs, and put on for the first time the glorious apparel of her earthly queenship, she began to gather together certain of her children into a holy brotherhood, for the purpose of giving more solemn burial to the dead, as if mindful, after her resurrection, of her own burial for three hundred years, she would teach them how precious in her sight is the Christian grave. And, from that day to this, there is not a work of mercy or compassion, not one deed of love which she has not first taught and then enabled her children to perform. She teaches them not to wait until their aid is asked for or required, but to be beforehand with the wants of their brother men. She bids them seek out the sick and suffering, and stand by their bedside and assuage their pains, and cool their fevered brow, and lessen their burning thirst, but above all to see that the oil and wine of the good Samaritan is poured into the wounds of their bleeding souls. She teaches them that "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the widow and fatherless in their affliction and to keep themselves unspotted from the world." She sends them to the prisoner and captive in his lonely cell; and if on earth the hour of mercy has passed away from him for ever, she bids them not to leave him to himself, but to speak to him of the better land whither he is hurrying, and of Him whom he is going to meet, and to stand by his side in the last procession, and to hold him in their arms as he mounts the fatal steps; nay, not even then to suffer him to die until he has made his peace with God. And how can he refuse, when she herself

* Morichini, degli Instituti di pubblica Carità in Roma, Prefazione, xxxviii.

for his sake has lifted up the Blessed Sacrament in every church, and all her children are praying for his soul? Nor after death does she suffer them to leave him. She bids them take his poor headless body and place it reverently in a Christian grave, and she comes herself with sweet-smelling incense and holy rite to honour it as the temple of the Holy Ghost. And she tells them to have masses offered for his soul, and thus purified and clean to give it back again to the God who gave it. As of old, so also now, she teaches her children to bury the dead, and some of them she sends into the lone Campagna, lest haply some poor labourer who has died far away from the homes of men, of sudden death, should lie uncared for and unburied; for nothing can escape her maternal love. Others, again, she sends to the relief of those who are ashamed to beg, or to help poor debtors in their difficulties, and lessen the load which is weighing down their lives, while, by a refinement of her love, she would have others to provide an advocate to plead the cause of those who are suffering unjustly but are too poor to vindicate their rights. And, as if all this were not enough, she has inspired the brotherhood of the Holy Apostles with the compassionate thought of setting apart a little space in some of the central churches of the city, where they who are in need may place a written statement of their wants, and thus be relieved in the privacy of their own homes, nor any shame be brought upon their honest poverty.

What a perfect realization of that faith which works by love! What a deference to the beauty of that poverty which the Church alone has ventured to call holy! And O how different from the spurious charity of our own country, where poverty, if not looked upon as crime, is always suspected and too often hated, where buildings somewhat worse than prisons are built for the helpless and the aged, and where Christian men have found out a way of feeding the poor of Christ by eating and drinking themselves at some festive board, and Christian women can come to the succour of those who are in need by listening themselves to soft music or mingling in the pleasant dance, clad in the gay luxury of too often immodest dress, while, perhaps, the wearied hands that have ministered to their vanity are sinking helpless to the ground, and soon will be laid idle in the grave! Better, perhaps, such charity than none at all! Be it so; but then let us call it by its right name. It is not, it can never be, the charity of Christ. But it may be asked, Have not "Charity Balls" found their way even into Rome? Perhaps; but then they are the charities of modern society, inventions of the nineteenth century, not the inspirations of the Bride of Christ, not the charities of Rome. Even in Rome there is the Carnival; but

then Christian Rome sanctifies the Carnival prostrate before the altar of her God.

And it is through the gates of such a city as this that the Protestant Dean of Canterbury could tell us, in *Good Words*, that he went away rejoicing, thanking God that his face was set homewards, and that the walls of Rome, where God's law was *not* kept, would soon be left far behind. Yet his face was set towards that other great city which, like old Pagan Rome, "sitteth upon many waters," and is "full of the abominations of the earth"; in which God's law is so kept, that the streets are stained with the blood of helpless infants murdered by their own mothers' hands! Good words indeed! bidding Englishmen and Englishwomen to thank God that they are not as other men are, or even as those poor inhabitants of Rome. When will men first cast out the mote which is in their own eye before they try to cast out the beam which is in their brother's eye. Yet again we say: "by their fruits ye shall know them"!

Thus reflected on His own city are seen some of the attributes of God, "coalescing in the flower and bloom of their combination in the glory and beauty of His eternal excellence." "The Lord God Almighty is the temple thereof, and the Lamb, for the glory of God hath enlightened it, and the Lamb is the lamp thereof." "Great is the Lord, and exceedingly to be praised in the city of our God, in His holy mountain. With the joy of the whole earth is Mount Sion founded on the sides of the north, the city of the Great King"!

Such are some of the thoughts which have been called up in our minds by the work of M. Veuillot. We have not attempted to review it, for it is not a new work, and has already been some years before the public, and we have feared lest the fragrance of Rome, which has been so lovingly gathered into its pages, should evaporate in passing through our hands. But because at this very moment Rome is more than ever the object of all our love, and all our prayers, we have ventured to recall to our readers' recollection a work, whose every page is suggestive of the fragrance, and interprets to us the language, and breathes the spirit of the city of the living God. Bitter with a sarcasm which has made bad men fear its author, yet tender with much love, it is an offering to Rome of a strong man's devotion, joined with the affection and humility of a little child. They who do not love Rome will not understand it. They who do understand it will love Rome all the more.

And never, surely, was Rome more worthy of our love, or more full of majesty in the sight of angels and of men than at

the present moment. Weak, as almost with a woman's weakness, while the rage and hatred, and madness of the armies of the evil one are at her gate, she is standing alone against Satan and the world; and yet not alone, because He is with her who is "Prince of the kings of the earth." And it is at such a time as this that she has gathered together the Princes and Bishops of Christ's Universal Church in her own great basilica over the body of S. Peter, to take counsel with her for the things which are for the peace of God's kingdom, and the healing of the nations. Before what we are writing meets our reader's eye, they will have met. Beneath them will be the rock of Peter, and around them the Everlasting Arms, and above them the Eternal Dove. What may seem good to the Holy Ghost and to them we cannot tell, but His Word which has brought them together will not return to Him empty. "He will cause the light of His countenance to shine upon them, that they may know His way upon earth, His salvation among the nations." And the day shall surely come when our children's children, even as we ourselves look back to the glories of Ephesus or Trent, will speak to one another, with grateful hearts, of the victory of Rome in the first Council of the Vatican.

ART. III.—THE ENGLISH PROTESTANT MARRIAGE LAW.

Bill for Legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.

IT was quite natural and to be expected that those who, for many years, have been agitating for a repeal of the law which makes void a marriage with the sister of a deceased wife, would seize the opportunity afforded by the meeting of a new Parliament, which largely represents the classes over which Anglicanism and the other traditions of the classes hitherto dominant in our polity have little or no influence. The vote on the second reading of Mr. Chambers's Bill shows that their calculations were not unfounded. There is much reason to fear that the measure may at no distant time be carried; for our reliance on the House of Lords on such questions is not what it might have been before it passed the Act, by virtue of which Lord Penzance is daily pronouncing the dissolution of marriages. It is certain that, if carried, the change effected will be found in its results far more important than most

people now imagine. We are therefore anxious that our readers should consider it, not as an isolated question of detail, but in connection with the course of events which have led to the existing state of things, and which alone can enable us to anticipate what may be before us.

It can hardly be questioned that among the social and political phenomena of our times, one of the most momentous is this—that all over Christendom, civil governments have cast away the bonds of the laws of the city of God. “*Dirumpamus vincula eorum; et projiciamus a nobis jugum eorum.*” There is, we believe, no European nation—we put aside, of course, the States of the Church—in which the judicial sentence of an ecclesiastical court is received as an authoritative settlement of the question which it determines; certainly none in which an action is illegal simply because it is forbidden by the law of the Church, or incumbent simply because required by that law. This is the direct effect of the Protestant Reformation—in fact, of all its direct effects nearly the only one remaining. As a religion Protestantism can now hardly be said to exist, and before long it will have ceased to exist altogether. But (to say nothing of its more remote effects, which are only too apparent) the one fundamental principle proclaimed by it from the first is now everywhere received as an axiom by politicians.

Before the so-called Reformation, any man, whether legislator or peasant, if asked how he knew that certain actions are criminal, and certain others duties, would have replied, that such is the teaching and law of the Church. In England, Scotland, Scandinavia, and one half of Germany and Switzerland, this answer was, almost in a moment, made impossible or unmeaning by the Reformation. In all those countries, and in a degree in all countries more or less influenced by them (as, for instance, in France), the basis upon which all moral and religious duties had hitherto rested, was in a moment removed. The moral code, indeed, upon most subjects remained as it had been—not men’s practice (which, as the Reformers themselves testify, was too fatally corrupted), but their admitted rule of right and wrong. The edifice was, to a superficial view, almost unaltered; but the foundation was gone. That things remained at first nearly as they had been, although very inconsistent, was quite natural. Men are creatures of habit, and upon moral questions especially, the best men and those who very justly have the greatest influence in fixing and maintaining the moral standard of a nation, are precisely the most reluctant to relax and undermine principles which they have been taught from childhood, even when quite unable to

defend them by any argument. For a while, therefore, the moral code of Protestant nations remained nearly the same that it had been.

But men are under a necessity of finding some intellectual basis for their systems, even when the grounds on which they really receive them have nothing to do with the intellect. The question recurred, how do we know that this is right and that wrong? And the answer, which to Protestant teachers and Protestant communities was almost a matter of necessity, was "from Scripture"; for Holy Scripture was, in truth, the only authority which the Reformation professed to recognize as sacred. If the New Testament had contained any code, the difficulty would at once have been met. But no one could even pretend that this was the case, and that it should have contained one, was in several respects inconsistent with the purposes of the Divine Wisdom. Of necessity, therefore, they were driven to fall back on the Old Testament.

In the Pentateuch, at least, there was a code given by God Himself, not indeed to all the world, not to Christians, but to a single nation in a particular and far from advanced moral and social state. Was it not possible to lay it down that this code was imposed by Divine authority on all Christians, and to show that what it commanded was in fact the same which was admitted to be the duty of Christians? If so the difficulty would be met. There would be a law, moral, political, and social, the authority of which no man could deny. This was the plan adopted by the Protestant divines. It was attended with extreme difficulties. First, there were whole books of the New Testament the especial object of which was to impress upon Christians that although that law, as coming from God Himself, was holy and good, and deserving of all study and reverence; yet over them, as Christians, it had no authority; nay, that to suppose it had any would be to make void the foundations of the Gospel and to forfeit their hope in Christ. Next, as might have been expected (for the works of God, divinely suited to the purpose for which He designs them, are by that very fact unsuited to purposes wholly different), this divine law, given by God to a wholly different class of people and for different purposes, was quite unfit to be made a complete moral code for Christians. Still the thing had to be done; for it was a matter of necessity to find some revealed authority for the moral law, and after rejecting that which God had given (God's commandments as testified by the Church), this was the most plausible one that remained. Besides, the Mosaic system was rightly revered by all Christians as the inspired record of a law given by God himself; and as such it

had always been cited and referred to in the teaching of the Church as an authority of the highest character, in terms which easily admitted of being wrested, as if they meant (what till then had never been thought of) that it was a code given by God to Christians. The plan adopted then was this:—What was really taken as the code of Christian morals was the moral law as laid down and enforced by the Church, with the omission only of certain portions of it, of which (for different reasons) Protestantism found it necessary to get rid. What remained was to be enforced; and for this purpose people were told that its authority was derived from the fact that it was part of the Divine law given by Moses. It was obvious on the face of it that many things commanded by Moses were not enforced in it. That difficulty was met by telling them that all those things belonged, not to the moral law of the Jews, but to their political or ceremonial laws, and that these last were not binding upon Christians. In the same way were got rid of those passages of the New Testament (especially in the writings of S. Paul), which declared that the law of Moses had as such no authority over Christians. The people were told that S. Paul was speaking only of the ceremonial and political parts of the Mosaic law which were not binding upon Christians, not of those parts which were. This was a bold undertaking, because no intelligent man could read carefully almost any one of S. Paul's epistles without seeing that the distinction made by the Protestant divines between the moral law of Moses and the ceremonial and political law of Moses had never even occurred to him. What S. Paul taught was, not that Christians were subject to one part of the law of Moses which was good, but not to another part of it (which was not good), but that, although it was all good, as coming from God, none of it was binding upon Christians, because not imposed on them by Him. What was given to them was, first, the natural law, which was binding on them as men; secondly, Christ's positive law testified by the Church; and, thirdly, the Church's own law, on those matters over which Christ had given her power. Denying this, but wishing to find some revealed authority for moral duty, the Protestant divines were driven to what was, in truth, a mere juggle. They taught—"God has forbidden this or that action to Christians because it is contrary to the law of Moses." "But," it was replied, "many things not forbidden to Christians are confessedly forbidden by the law of Moses. How, then, can we be sure that this is not one of them?" "Because this is part of the moral law." "And what do you mean by the moral law?" "I mean that

which is binding, not on the Jews only, but on all men, and especially on Christians." Thus they reasoned in a circle. "This commandment is binding upon Christians because it is moral; and it is moral because it is binding upon Christians." But it was a greater difficulty still that the Mosaic law permitted, and even commanded, some things which were forbidden by the very system of morals which they desired to base exclusively upon it—that is, by Christian tradition modified only on one or two points. Thus, the Mosaic law allowed, and in one case (that of two married brethren, one of whom should die childless) even prescribed, polygamy. And yet the same men undertook to teach both that the Mosaic law had been made by Divine authority the moral code of Christians, and also that polygamy was forbidden to them. Again, although the observance of the Lord's day is nowhere commanded, either in the Old or even in the New Testament, these teachers retained what the Church taught on this subject; and in order to find some authority for it without acknowledging that of the Church, audaciously told the people that it was commanded by the Mosaic law in the fifth (or, as they counted it, the fourth) commandment of the Decalogue.

The inevitable consequence of this was to transfer to the civil government of each country, supreme authority to decide what was morally right and what morally wrong. There was, in fact, no alternative. The law of Moses, which the people were told was to be their code, left many things undecided, and clearly decided others in a sense contrary to what they were told (very truly) they were bound to practise. The Protestant sects and their theologians had no authority to say what was and what was not binding; and, to do them justice, did not in general even pretend to it. The authority which God had committed to His Church was abjured. The private judgment of each individual, whether founded on natural instinct or on his interpretation of Holy Scripture, was a guide, more or less trustworthy, to his individual conscience, but could be binding on no one else; and hence was no rule for any community. The only possible resort that remained was to the civil power; and hence in all Protestant countries the law of the land became the only rule of right and wrong which even pretended to have any authority. It is true that for a long time civil legislatures, in making moral enactments, were wont to profess that their decrees were founded on Scripture. Thus the "table of kindred and affinity" still to be seen in most of the old churches of England, professes to declare what "persons are forbidden to marry together in Scripture and our laws." But this means on the face of it,

"in Scripture as interpreted by our laws," an interpretation from which in the nature of things there could be no appeal, except to the judgment of each individual man, woman, and child. The practical result was that the law of the land became the moral code of Protestants. Paley laments this in the opening of his "*Moral Philosophy*." That work is an attempt to substitute for it what he considered a better basis of morality. But a most unsatisfactory attempt it was. He substitutes for the law of the land "the will of the Creator as proved by general expediency." But who is to decide, authoritatively, for a nation which rejects the Divinely authorized guide, what is and what is not generally expedient? Clearly only the civil Ruler. Paley's rule, therefore, comes in the end to the same that he desires to supersede.

Thus the State became, in fact, the judge and ruler of moral right and wrong in all Protestant countries; and in those which remained Catholic, the civil governments were under a temptation only too obvious to follow the example of usurpation. Rulers like Joseph II., attempted to do this, by taking the ecclesiastical authority into their own hands. The principles of '89 (adopted first in France and afterwards by the ruling powers in other Catholic states), transferred morals from the ecclesiastical to the civil forum. It is not too much to say that the principle is now universally acted upon in Europe; that all questions, social and moral no less than political, are to be settled by the government of each State for its own subjects. Where a country is thoroughly divided in religion, there is in fact nothing else to be done. Unhappily many States not so divided have now followed the example.

The practical establishment of this principle is, in a certain very real sense, a dissolution of the union between Church and State. Before that union was made, there were, in all countries in which the Church existed two authorities, independent and often conflicting,—the authority of the Church, which regulated for Christians all matters that in any way touched the conscience (including among others their duty to the civil governor); and the authority of the State, which claimed to regulate and control, for all its subjects alike, all matters, interests, and duties. Each society had its own rulers and its own judicature. Each man, if a Christian, was equally subject to both. Both, in most instances, judged and determined the same matters. It often happened that what one commanded the other forbade. In that case, it became the duty of a Christian to obey the Church, even although his doing so implied disobedience to the civil power; and

when he suffered for this, he was honoured by the Church as a martyr. Such was the original relation of Church and State in the Roman Empire.

When the two were united, the laws of the Church, in virtue of being her laws, were acknowledged as laws of the empire. The Church courts continued to judge of very many subjects, as they had done before. The only change was that now their decisions were recognized by the State, so that what they had decided was held to have been decided by authority. This state of things, which existed in all Christian nations until the Reformation, now exists no longer. The disputes now going on concern such matters as the civil dignity attached by the State to the rulers of the Church, and the influence and power in ecclesiastical matters which the State not unnaturally drew to itself under the new order of things. These things are often spoken of by men to whom worldly matters seem more important than anything else, as if in them primarily consisted the union of Church and State. But, alas ! those civil prerogatives of the Church in which that union primarily consisted no longer *de facto* exist. Civil governments, on one ground or another, have assumed an independence of all spiritual authorities in their mode of dealing with social and moral questions which has practically put an end to those prerogatives. The disputes which from day to day arise between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, now in one part of the world now in another (at this moment, for instance, in the Austrian empire), are, in fact, much like the questions which arise whenever a long-existing partnership is dissolved. The conditions on which they are now settled will regulate the relations of the two co-ordinate powers in the new state of society which is before us. What those relations may be, can, as yet, be only imperfectly conjectured. As far as man can foresee, they will be very different from those which existed either before the union, or while that union was still preserved in vigour and completeness.

This state of things could hardly be more strikingly illustrated than by the fact that in convening the nineteenth General Council the Holy Father has not felt himself able to follow the example of his predecessors by inviting the sovereigns of Christendom to attend it either by themselves or their ambassadors. Instead of this, he exhorts them (in the Apostolic Letter "*Æterni Patris*") to "throw no impediment in the way of the attendance of the bishops, and to co-operate in whatever may conduce to the welfare of the Council." We have no means of predicting what the Vatican Council will decree ; but that its decrees will be specially adapted to a state of things

so different from that which existed during the sitting of any former General Council, it needs no prophet to anticipate.

It might, perhaps, seem that nations which have thus made up their minds to arrange all moral and social questions not in accordance with the teaching of the Church, but upon mere worldly principles, would of necessity fall back upon the moral standard of heathens, to whom its teaching was never known. No doubt, individuals who have rejected the truth are in many respects worse than those who never knew it. But experience teaches, what reflection would perhaps have suggested, that upon most subjects, the moral teaching of the Church is so manifestly consistent with the soundest reason, that a community which has for centuries been subject to its educating sway, even in professedly rejecting its authority, can hardly help retaining for the most part the moral rules it has taught. What such a community does is to claim principles and rules which as a matter of fact reason and philosophy, even under the most favourable circumstances and in ages of the highest culture, never originated, as discoveries of human reason, on the ground that reason accepts and approves them—nay, can demonstrate their truth—when once fully established. Thus the French Positivists declare that reason condemns slavery, denounces war, and maintains the just position of woman as the equal, not the slave, of man, and (except in one rare case) the indissoluble character of marriage. Yet nothing is more certain than that reason never did discover any of these principles; it has borrowed them from the Catholic Church. We believe, therefore, that there is good reason to hope that the governments of nations which have long been Christian, even while rejecting the teaching and authority of the Church (whatever their conduct may be), will upon most subjects retain, as their avowed principles, the rules of Christian morality, and that there is little reason to fear that we shall see Christendom fall back, as to most moral and social questions, upon what we may call the uninspired system.

But to this there is one important exception. There is one subject upon which we may be sure that any nation which rejects the teaching of the Church, will before very long be irresistibly tempted to tamper with the first principles of Christian morality. That subject is the law of marriage. For not only is that law a sharp curb upon human passion and a defence of the weak against the strong,—in addition to this, it adds very materially to the restrictions of what we may call the natural law on this subject, and moreover, from its very nature, it cannot be fully carried out by any mere code, but requires the perpetual superintendence of a living

authority. For the New Testament contains no code of laws upon this subject, and that which we have received from God through the medium of His Church not only lays down precise rules, but for the general good, gives, within certain limits, a power of dispensing with them to the Vicar of Christ. This salutary and divinely authorized system could not in the nature of things be retained in any country in which the legislative, executive, judicial, and teaching authority of the Church is, unhappily, denied. Hence it could not but have happened, as we see it, that the whole history of Protestantism has been that of a gradual relaxation of the Christian law of marriage. The permission given by the leading German Reformers to the Landgrave of Hesse, by which polygamy was permitted, was the first—but only the first—example of a relaxation which has ever since been growing worse and worse. That, scandalous as it was, had been only an individual outrage, and he had been most strictly charged to keep it secret. But we have now before our eyes the practical working of Protestantism during three centuries, and can therefore see for ourselves what the necessary results of its principles are, by seeing what they have actually effected. Deferring for a moment to notice the British Isles, what is marriage in Continental Protestant countries? The evidence printed by Parliament sufficiently shows. There are two subjects in particular upon which the Christian law is stringent. First, in its prohibition of marriages between certain persons; next, in the Divine enactment that a marriage once validly contracted and completed between Christians can never be dissolved except by death. There is no Protestant country in Continental Europe or in America in which both of these laws have not, by the Reformation, been wholly swept away. Throughout Protestant Germany practice allows marriages between all persons except parents and their children, and brothers and sisters. The same, we believe, is now the case in the United States of America, except that marriages between uncles and nieces are there still forbidden. Thus, to speak generally, all the restrictions imposed by religion to prevent marriage between any man and any woman are taken away. It is very remarkable to observe how this was done. Immediately after the Reformation the Levitical law on this subject was declared to be binding on Christians. Before very long men desired greater liberty than that law, as interpreted by Lutheran authorities, allowed. They wished for dispensations. But who was to give them? Protestantism had made the civil governor the chief authority in matters ecclesiastical. To him therefore belonged the power of dis-

pensation. A German lawyer giving evidence on this subject in England, says : *—" Since the Reformation, the judicial rights of the " Summus Episcopus " have been assumed by, and conferred by the Church Evangelical upon, the Sovereign. The Sovereigns, or those bodies exercising sovereign power, in all the Protestant parts of Germany, instituted their own consistorial courts, which are composed partly of divines called consistorial councillors and partly of secular judges, and which courts have jurisdiction in all matters relating to marriage and divorce. They grant dispensations in the name of the Sovereign." But in answer to the question, " Must there be a dispensation in every case from some ecclesiastical authority ? " The same witness says :—" Not always : either from our consistorial courts, or from the judicial department of the ministry of justice, which grants a dispensation in the name of the Sovereign." So much did it become a fixed principle with the Continental Protestants, that the king was to exercise the supreme authority in such matters, that they applied it even to countries like France, where the king and the government were Catholics, and where Protestantism was only tolerated. Thus Louis XIII. was recognized by the French Protestants as their " Summus Episcopus."

The practical effect has been that everywhere the notion of any restriction upon marriages between persons " near of kin," with the exception of parents, brothers, and sisters, has been lost. As to divorce, the process has been the same. The principle was everywhere laid down from the very time of the Reformation, that divorces dissolving marriage and allowing remarriage were possible. Very soon it came to be fixed, that it belonged to the civil ruler to settle for what causes such dissolutions of marriage should be allowed, and to grant them in each case. The supreme direction of the most delicate moral subjects was thus put into the hands of Sovereigns, taught from childhood that they were responsible to no one on earth, and who, if in rare and exceptional instances they were told that any law existed higher than their own caprice, were at the very best told that that law was to be found in their own private interpretation of Scripture. It would indeed be a happy accident, which we have no reason to expect, if such a ruler continued to act under any serious sense of his responsibility to Almighty God. Even when not guided, like Henry VIII. and too many Protestant kings, by his own lusts and tyranny, he has been influenced at best by a good-natured desire to make things easy.

* Pusey, page lxxxviii.

His installation as "Summus Episcopus" has, in fact, made the world, with its wishes, passions, and maxims, the supreme authority in matters of morals. The result of his rule has already been that among Continental Protestants, what is still called marriage has practically been changed into an authorized agreement between a man and woman to live together as long as shall be agreeable to both of them; and into this temporary partnership any man may enter with any woman, so that they are not related as parent and child or as brother and sister. Every one has heard anecdotes of the practical working of this system in Protestant Germany—how a gentleman at a party finds himself, quite accidentally, sitting down to whist with three ladies, every one of whom has, at one time or another, been his wife—and how another, referring at table to an event, the date of which he wished to recall, said, looking towards the lady, at the head of the table, "it happened when I had the honour to be husband to our amiable hostess." Instances, no doubt, there are of couples remaining together honourably and with mutual love during their lives. But this is not because they feel themselves bound to do so by any law, human or divine, recognized and admitted by them, but from natural amiability of temper, strengthened by the traditionary feeling remaining in all lands which have been long Christian, and by seeing the standard of the Christian law maintained before their eyes by the Catholic populations with which they are intermingled. Making, however, full allowance for all this, the result is that among Continental Protestants Christian marriage can hardly be said to exist.

And the evil results to be anticipated from this, except so far as they are counteracted by the reaction, which in Germany, as well as here, is strongly setting in towards the Catholic Church, can hardly be estimated, even by saying that it threatens to bring back, with regard to marriage, the moral standard of heathenism; for heathenism has usually been controlled in practice by principles which do not exist in a civilized European society of our age. Its chief hold has been upon nations in a rough, hard, and violent state of society, and one in which, as a general rule, women have been regarded by the law as little more than chattels. In such nations, one half of the human race are shielded from the temptation to license by being kept under a very strict and stern rule. The despotic power of the head of the family in a great measure enforces upon women at least, many of those restraints which in Catholic countries are secured by the general reverence for the Divine law. Besides, as regards both sexes, the characteristic of such times is that law and national feeling strictly enforce whatever

rules have been handed down by tradition from distant times. A refined state of civilization removes these restraints both from men and from women. Individual liberty is prized and maintained ; and old customs and traditions are made light of and laid aside, if they cannot be defended by argument as well as by authority. Woe to that nation in which, as these restraints lose their power by the progress of refinement, there is nothing better to supply their place. The change was never more miserably illustrated than in the history of Roman society. The later Romans used to boast with sorrow and envy of their rude and martial ancestors, by whose moral feelings divorce was rejected, although allowed by law. What the Romans became in this matter when subjected to the influences of wealth and luxury, a Christian pen refuses to record. Every schoolboy knows to what cause the age of Augustus attributed the prevailing miseries :—

Fœcunda culpæ sæcula nuptias
Primum inquinavere, et genus, et domos.
Hoc fonte derivata clades
In patriam populumque fluxit.

The barbarians of the North, when they broke in upon the empire at a later period, were still in this respect what the Romans had been in the more glorious times of Rome. The Romans themselves confessed the contrast, and said : “ Inter pudicos barbaros impudici sumus. Plus adhuc dico. Offenduntur barbari ipsi impuritibus nostris. Esse inter Gothos non licet Scortatorem Gothum. Soli inter eos præjudicio nationis ac nominis, permittuntur impuri esse Romani.”* This was no result of any special or exceptional tendency of the Roman nation. We have no reason from history to believe that there ever existed any nation, not Christian, in which what are often called the natural virtues were originally more strongly rooted than they were among the Romans, or in which they have so long stood their ground against the corrupting influences of wealth and luxury. The universal judgment of the ancient world was, that every nation in its turn, when it had attained greatness and power, became cankered by indulgence and luxury, and then decayed and died away from within. It was of this that the Catos and the rest of the old school of conservatives in the Roman senate lived in continual fear. Against it they spent their lives in an ineffectual protest. They were for maintaining the social

* Salvian, lib. vii.

traditions and sumptuary laws of old Rome, because if pleasure and luxury once became fashionable, they knew no principle which it would be possible to oppose to them. No one thought them mistaken. No one contradicted them when they declared that virtue was beautiful, but for himself each man preferred pleasure. Were they wrong in believing that this canker was certain to eat into the vitals of every heathen state which once became easy and luxurious, and that no antidote known to them was potent enough to meet the evil? We believe not. Constituted as man is, we believe that every such society contains in itself the seeds of moral and social death, and that nothing will be found powerful enough to arrest their growth except the supernatural graces given through the gospel of Christ, and the precepts, faith, hopes, fears, and loves by which it sways the heart. Nay more, we think that these will never be so practically brought home to any refined and polished nation as to exercise their full influence upon it; unless, in open contradiction to the allurements of pleasure and luxury, it sees visibly before its eyes men and women choosing obedience, poverty, and celibacy as their highest happiness. Where such communities are in action before men's eyes, they cannot help seeing and feeling, what the later Romans admitted perhaps, but did not believe, that there are in this world other and better kinds of happiness than luxury and self-indulgence can promise. We believe, therefore, that the religious orders, so far from being, as many liberal Protestants imagine, useful only in times of lawless violence, and unsuited for an age of refinement and civilization, are (especially in such an age) the salt of the earth, without which society will certainly tend to speedy decay.

Such, beyond a doubt, is the natural course of Protestant nations, their growth and their decay,—inevitable unless the process is interrupted by the presence of the Catholic Church among them. And if so, what must we fear or what may we hope for England, upon which Protestantism, alas! has taken so firm a hold?

In answer to this question, it would imply a base ingratitude to the Giver of all Good if we failed thankfully to acknowledge that in England the natural, nay, the inevitable results of Protestantism have, by His mercy, been so much held back and delayed that, three centuries after the change of religion, we still see Protestantism only just passing out of that which we know by experience to be its first stage. Everywhere it begins by setting up the Levitical law as a complete Christian code, to the exclusion of the living authority which God has established; gradually it gives up its reverence for that code,

and falls back upon the law of nature (or what it considers to be such), and upon the law of the land; at length it abandons very nearly every restraint. It is a singular thing that while all other Protestant nations have long ago reached this last stage, England has not yet completely abandoned the first. It is but yesterday that English Protestants, professedly and avowedly, abolished that Divine law which makes marriage indissoluble save by death. Even now they do not, as yet, admit divorces *a vinculo*, except in cases of adultery, and that (if the husband is the guilty party) in aggravated cases. As to the prohibition of marriage between persons "near of kin," the rule still remains as it was fixed immediately after the change of religion.

We cannot be too thankful that such is the case, especially when we take it in connection with the "second Spring" which is now calling forth the Catholic Church in England to a new life. For, although the grace of God can conquer any obstacles, yet the deeper the corruption of the national manners, the lower the standard of morals, the more difficult is the conquest, and the less reason we have to hope that a grace so extraordinary and inestimable will ever be granted.

Would that we were able to accept the explanation offered by our Ritualist countrymen of this exceptional favour, by which England is so much distinguished from other Protestant countries, and to imagine it accounted for by the peculiarities by which the English Establishment is distinguished from other Protestant bodies. Nothing is more certain than that Protestantism has been running the same course here as elsewhere, although, thank God, circumstances have hitherto delayed in this respect its full development. With regard to marriage and divorce, the English Reformers were quite as favourable to licence as those on the Continent. In the reign of Edward VI. a commission was issued to Cranmer, Ridley, and eight others, to inquire and report, whether the Marquis of Northampton, who had divorced his wife, might marry another. That the existing laws, being those of the Catholic Church, did not allow it, was admitted; and in consequence the ecclesiastical court had given him only a divorce *a mensâ et thoro*. Collier says: "The case being new" [*i.e.*, not having been settled by any Protestant authority in England, for it was "new" in no other sense], "Cranmer resolved to examine it with the utmost care, and to go to the bottom of the question. To this purpose he drew a large collection out of the Fathers and other divines." The arguments at length are given by Collier, and Burnett reprints (from Stillingfleet's MS.) a series of Latin questions put to learned men, whose

names are not given. All these Protestant authorities were of one mind—that marriage may be dissolved, that both parties ought to be allowed to marry again, and that a divorce *a mensâ et thoro* is in no case lawful. The Marquis, in consequence of this opinion, obtained the first dissolution of marriage ever given by Act of Parliament. But this was not (like Luther's sanction of polygamy), on the part of the English Reformers, a mere act of cowardice, conceding, as a special privilege to a powerful man, what was not to be allowed to all the world. For the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, the code of Protestant ecclesiastical law which was to supersede in England the law of the Church, allowed divorce in case of adultery by either party, or of desertion and absence, a wife being permitted to marry "in two or three years" if her husband remained abroad, "either on the score of merchandise, or of serving in the field, and no tidings could be heard of him." Only in this case the second marriage was to be a sort of temporary engagement, because, if the first husband should return, and should "prove that he had been so long delayed either by accident or necessity," he had the right of "breaking the second marriage," and claiming back his wife. Besides these cases, divorces were to be allowed to either party in cases of cruelty and irreconcilable enmity.*

It is plain that such a law would practically have allowed a divorce in every case, if it were desired by both parties; and it is strongly declared that every divorce was, in all possible cases, to imply the dissolution of marriage. Any degree of licence would have been covered by such ample terms. This new code of ecclesiastical laws was never actually enforced in the Church of England, merely owing to the accident of Edward VI.'s death, after it had been drawn up by the Reformers (who were authorized to do so by an Act of Parliament and by a Royal Commission), and just before it had been ratified. No document could more clearly represent the spirit of the English Reformation. By a happy accident the Divine law which makes marriage indissoluble, except by death, was never formally set aside in England until the Act of Parliament of 1858 established the unhappy system now administered by Her Majesty's Court of Probate and Divorce.

* Hallam, *Con. Hist.*, vol. i. chap. ii., says: "Divorce was allowed for something more than incompatibility of temper, namely, *capitales inimicitie*, meaning, as I conceive, attempts by one party on the other's life." Why he puts this meaning on the word he does not explain. Lingard supposes that in this case neither party might marry again. He does not give his grounds for this, and we cannot reconcile it with the positive language in which divorces *a mensâ et thoro* are forbidden in all possible cases.

In the debates upon that Act the Catholic doctrine that marriage can be dissolved only by death was maintained, greatly to their honour, by the present Protestant bishops of Oxford and Salisbury; and, unless we are mistaken, by no other of their order. We very greatly doubt whether they are not the first Protestant divines of England who ever maintained it. If there are any names which the popular feeling of Anglicans has honoured with a quasi canonization, they are those of Thomas Wilson, Protestant bishop of Sodor and Man, and Lancelot Andrewes, of Winchester. Both have left practical proof of the strongest kind that they did not regard marriage as indissoluble. Wilson formally allowed a wife to marry while her husband was living. There was nothing to suggest the suspicion that that good man made, in that instance, any concession to undue influence contrary to his sense of right. With Andrewes it was otherwise. It gives us sincere pain to remember that he was not only one of the delegates by whose scandalous sentence the marriage of the profligate Countess of Essex was set aside, that she might marry the unworthy favourite of James I., but that his vote in favour of the divorce is specially recorded;* while some of the other delegates ventured to object to it.

We are not aware that any Anglican divine, from the Reformation to our own day, has ever maintained that marriage can in no case be dissolved. And, although until our own day, the law made it indissoluble, it is not to be forgotten that that truly Christian law was maintained on the statute-book only because the class which, until our own day, had exclusive control of the legislature, had devised and maintained, for its own benefit, an evasion by which it was exempted from the operation of the law—a private Act of Parliament (*privilegium*) passed, as a matter of course, in favour of any husband who had obtained in the ecclesiastical court a divorce *a mensâ et thoro*, and who could afford the expense. The change made in our own time is in theory immense; in practice it only amounts to this, that the other classes to which political power has now been extended have claimed a share in the licence which the gentry (who formerly monopolized it) had already secured for themselves. We have always felt that no practice so cynically shameless as that of our old Divorce Acts ever disgraced any Christian country, and the Anglican Church was from first to last most miserably mixed up with it. Its history is important, as illustrating the fact to which we specially desire to call attention, that in a country like ours above all others, to

* State Trials.

make the least concession as to the strictness of the law of marriage, even in a single case, is like "the letting out of waters." When the breach, however small, is once effected, the rushing tide of lawless passions soon widens it, till it sweeps away all obstacles. And this is specially the case because in every Protestant country, those teachers whose instinctive feeling impels them to maintain the ancient strictness of practice, after having abjured the only Divine authority, are really defending a position which, however commendable, is in them inconsistent and illogical.

The first marriage dissolved by Act of Parliament (after that of the Marquis of Northampton under Edward VI.) was that of Lord Roos (afterwards first Duke of Rutland), in 1670. A great political object was to be attained. The first attempt of the Protestant party, which afterwards strove in vain to pass an Act to exclude the Duke of York from the succession, was to enable Charles II. to divorce his queen and marry another wife, by whom he might leave legitimate heirs. For this there was no precedent. But they determined to create one. With this view they successfully pressed forward a Bill, to enable Lord Roos (whose wife had already been divorced) to marry again. The object was perfectly understood, and this private Bill was taken up on both sides as a public matter. The Duke of York employed all his interest against it, and the king (who supported it), in order to make the most of his own, introduced a custom (without precedent for nearly two centuries) of taking his place on the throne in the House of Lords to watch the debates—a custom which he continued during his life, and which he used to declare was "as good as a play." The Bill was passed by a majority of two votes. Of the Protestant bishops, two voted for it, and thirteen signed the protest of the Duke of York against it. But the precedent was set. It was followed in the case of the Duke of Norfolk (a Protestant), who moved unsuccessfully for an Act of the kind in 1695, and obtained it in 1700. From that time there was, on an average, rather more than one a year for many years. Of late years, with the increase of population and wealth, they had naturally become more frequent. We are not aware that on any occasion after 1700 any opposition was made to the principle of these Divorce Acts by any Protestant bishop; and the course adopted, which practically became part of our "glorious Constitution in Church and State," was this. The husband (as a condition of obtaining from the ecclesiastical court of the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury a divorce *a mensâ et thoro*) was required to sign a bond, by which he bound himself, under very heavy pecuniary penalties, not to

marry during the life of his divorced wife. He then obtained an Act of Parliament authorizing him to marry and cancelling the bond. Armed with this he returned to the ecclesiastical court of the Archbishop, and, as a matter of course, obtained from it a marriage licence, the regular form of which was in these words:—"To our dearly beloved in Christ, A. B., a single and unmarried person, his former marriage with C. D. having been annulled by Act of Parliament." The licence then went on in the usual form to testify that the archbishop was informed of the desire of A. B. to contract lawful matrimony, and, highly approving that laudable desire, was pleased to dispense with the celebration of banns, &c.; and in virtue of this licence, the new marriage received such sanction and blessing as the Reformed Protestant Church of England has to give. There are many persons still living, and among them Anglican clergymen, who have been married in virtue of such licences. The principles to which the Anglican Church committed itself by this practice were, first, that by the law of God marriage is in all cases indissoluble; and, next, that a valid dispensation from the obligation of that Divine law may be granted, when occasion arises, by Act of Parliament. Thus a power which no pope ever thought of assuming was recognized by the Church of England as belonging to the king, Lords, and Commons. This has always seemed to us the wildest extreme to which the Anglican doctrine of the royal supremacy could conceivably have been carried. It is amazing to remember that at the very period when Tractarian influence was at its height, it was still the established and recognized practice, both of the English State and the Anglican Church; and that it only ceased to be a regular practice when the law was passed by which the Divorce Court was established. In exceptional cases it is still continued; and, in particular, it is still the recognized principle of the not yet disestablished Protestant Church of Ireland.

It is only just to acknowledge, that the "Peers Spiritual and Temporal and the Commons," who passed these Divorce Acts, dispensed with a law which, although it really was of Divine authority, they did not believe to be so. They no doubt felt that the doctrine that marriage is indissoluble, was "a remnant of Popery," which had been left, accidentally and unintentionally, among the laws of a Protestant Church. But the precedent led of necessity to the law by which the present Divorce Court is authorized. It was impossible to deny, that it had been the rule for more than a hundred and fifty years, that any man who could pay for a private Act of Parliament might lawfully marry during the life of his

divorced wife ; and when equality before the law had once become an established principle, it followed of necessity that the same liberty could not justly be refused, under the same circumstances, to those who could not afford that costly luxury. The old system could not possibly have stood its ground, in times when the people at large had become an important, if not a predominant political power. The Bishop of Oxford, greatly to his honour, pledged himself publicly in the House of Lords, that if the measure constituting the Divorce Court were rejected, he would never, as long as he lived, allow a Divorce Act to pass unopposed at least by him. More could not well have been done to clear himself as an individual, of any complicity with a system which had been established by the sufferance of his predecessors more than a century before he was born. Perhaps it would be unjust to blame the other Protestant bishops of our own day for taking as a matter of routine, before their attention was specially called to it, what they found so handed down to them. Unhappily the Act passed the House by a majority of one, so that he never had the opportunity of doing more against it.

With these considerations in our minds, we return to the Bill which last session passed the second reading in the Commons by so large a majority. We repeat our conviction that much more really depends upon the success or failure of the present proposal than might appear at first sight to have any connection with it. In itself it may seem a small concession, applying only to a few individual cases. But so to consider it would be most miserably to underrate its importance. A great question is at stake on a single case. That question is whether England shall any longer retain her traditionary estimate of marriage, or whether she shall follow other Protestant nations. This is our reason for considering it in connection with the subject of divorce, with which it may seem at first sight to have no connection. We are convinced that the connection is really very close :—

Wedded life with loyal Christians,
Lady, is a mystery rare ;
Body, heart, and soul in union
Make one being of a pair.

This expresses no more than those words of the Eternal Word, "They two shall be one flesh" ; and hence it results both that never in this world can they be divided, and also that those "near of kin" to the one are "near of kin" to the other. The sanctity of the mystic tie cannot be lessened in one

aspect and not lessened at the same time in the other. If the tie is such that man can loosen it, no wonder that those whom it binds are not so joined that the kindred of the one become the kindred of the other. Natural instinct says this, and what it says is confirmed by experience. Where marriage with those near of kin to a deceased wife has been allowed, there marriage itself has always been treated as a tie which human law could unbind. Where divorces have been allowed, there the persons nearest of kin to the wife have been declared strangers in blood to the husband; and so, beyond all question, it will be in England if any relaxation is admitted. The question now at stake is, whether England shall maintain her traditionary estimate of marriage, or whether she shall follow too many Protestant nations, and go on step by step till she comes to treat it as a contract of no special holiness, which any two may make if they will, and which is binding no longer than agrees with the fancy of those who make it.

Towards that miserable result, we are firmly convinced, this Bill will be a most important and an irrevocable stride. It can be defended only on the ground that no near relationship with the wife's sister is really contracted by her husband. But if not, then neither is such relationship contracted with her mother nor her daughter. And then, again, there is no real relationship between a man and his brother's wife. One fatal step our country has already taken in admitting the dissolution of marriage. This Bill, if carried, will most assuredly be a second; and every new breach in the barrier which old customs and rules still oppose to the swelling tide of men's passions, will but invite a wilder and more overwhelming tide.

We are not merely reasoning, on grounds ever so certain, as to what will be. The experience of other Protestant countries shows us what has already been, and there is no reason to doubt that what has been the result of such relaxations, both in Germany and America, will also be the result in England. Upon this subject we would especially refer to the book published some years ago by Sir J. Page Wood, the present Lord Chancellor.

In this article we have preferred to treat the subject on general principles, instead of considering the proposed change by itself, and estimating its probable consequences, or answering the arguments by which it has been supported. Else we should have protested against the strange statement so confidently made, that it is only of late years that marriages with a deceased wife's sister have been unlawful; the fact being

that they have always been forbidden in England, although the mode in which the courts take cognizance of them has been changed. Never has there been one day since S. Augustine landed in Kent on which such a marriage could have been contracted by baptized persons without a previous dispensation from the law.

We must confess ourselves puzzled how those "respectable" persons who have already made such marriages explain to themselves their own position. By what authority do they imagine that such questions are settled? They are Protestants, and therefore cannot say by the authority of the Church. Yet, without waiting for a change of the law, they have contracted a union which the law solemnly declares to be no marriage. Do they or do they not think themselves man and wife? If they do, it can be only on this ground,—that they, as individuals, think that such marriages ought to be recognized by law, and that therefore they have a right to act as if they were so recognized. It is hardly possible to imagine a principle which would admit licence more wild.

The ground on which it is now maintained that the law ought to be altered is, that in the private opinion of those who are agitating for the change, such unions are allowed by the Levitical law, and that any law or canon is absolutely null and void by which any church or nation attempts to impose any restraint on marriage, which is not imposed by the Levitical law. If every man has a right thus to act for himself, on his own interpretation of a confessedly difficult text, how much more clear is his right to practise polygamy, which the Levitical law, beyond all question or dispute, did allow?

There is great force in the argument that the proposed change will make the sweet relationship of sisters-in-law as it now exists no longer possible to millions who are contentedly reverencing the law which they believe to be from God, in order to relieve from a certain degree of stigma and inconvenience some score of persons who, because they think the law unquestionably existing a mistake, have already taken the liberty of setting it at defiance.

If our space would allow, we would gladly enlarge upon these social and moral consequences of the change considered by itself. But to us its real importance is that, as we have already said, it is but one more step in a fatal career. We are Catholics living in a Protestant nation. Even if that were all, and if we were still, like those who went before us, only captives and exiles in the land of our fathers, still the command given to the captive sons of Israel would apply to us. "Seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be

carried away captives, and pray unto the Lord for it, for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace." But, thank God, as men free of this great English commonwealth, we have double reason to do our utmost to maintain, as long as possible, the national standard of morals, even if it were certain that no change could in any way affect Catholics. But in truth this is only partially the case. To mention nothing else, it is a great evil (from which we are not even now free) that converts should submit to the Catholic Church after having already contracted unions which the law declared to be valid, but which it is impossible that she should even by dispensation sanction or connive at. This will be far more common than it yet is, if the English law of marriage is further relaxed. Again, we all already feel the difficulty and danger of having to educate children in the midst of a society whose moral tone is far lower than that of the Catholic Church. But not to mention any of those considerations, we for our own part feel it to be, to say the very least, unbecoming, that a change which would make the law of our country contradict the law of the Church on one of the points on which it has always hitherto agreed with it, should be supported even by a single Catholic vote. The law of England as it now stands, declares a marriage with a wife's sister invalid. Whence came this law? It was borrowed from the Catholic Church, and the Catholic Church still retains it. It is a paradox to say that the English law would not be less Catholic if it allowed one thing more which the Church strictly forbids. It is true the Church has power, in exceptional cases, to dispense with the prohibition. Right gladly would we see our country render homage to the laws of the Church, by enacting that in any such exceptional case the marriage shall be exceptionally legal. But this we well know is, at least for the present, out of the question. The only question is whether it shall, with the true Church, continue to pronounce them invalid, without recognizing (as we should wish) the Church's power of dispensation, or whether, in direct opposition to the law of the Church, it shall pronounce them, in every case, valid and legal. Of these two, we choose the first. That such dispensations, when given, are valid, is absolutely certain and unquestionable; but it is notorious that they are never given without reluctance. It is one of those permissions which the Church, like her Lord, grants *propter duritiam cordium*, and only to prevent greater evils. And no one can image that the authorities of the Church would desire a change of the law, which would of necessity make men more ready to press for them; least of all, one

which might make ignorant Catholics suppose that the granting of them is a matter of course. How exceedingly rare such dispensations actually are among Irish Catholics, Mr. O'Reilly* showed in the House of Commons. That in these exceptional cases the civil consequences of marriage do not follow, is so far an injustice to Catholics. But we believe that no one case can be shown in which any practical injury has resulted from it; and Catholics, thank God, are so well aware that the validity and invalidity of marriages is settled, not by the laws of the land, but by the laws of God, that such a marriage, in the rare cases in which it is allowed, is known by them to be as valid as any other, and any pecuniary loss which might, in a very rare case, befall the children or the widow owing to their position not being recognized by the law, measures the whole amount of their practical sufferings by the present state of the law.

Even if, on the whole, it were clear that Catholics would gain something and lose nothing by the proposed change, we would not have any of them responsible for bringing about a change, which will be morally injurious to so many of their countrymen. Better, no doubt, if it be so, and far more consistent with the past glorious history of Catholics in England and Ireland, that they should suffer injustice, than that they should do anything, even although in itself not unlawful, which in its results would issue in the increase of sin, in the lessening of the glory of God, and in the loss of souls.

* In the diocese of Armagh (comprising two whole counties and parts of three others) there had not been a single marriage with a deceased wife's sister during the last three years, nor, he believed, long before that also. In the diocese of Ardagh two cases in fourteen years. In the archdeaconry of Dublin not two a year, although there much more frequent than anywhere else.

ART. IV.—MR. AUBREY DE VERE'S IRISH ODES.

Irish Odes and other Poems. By AUBREY DE VERE. New York : Catholic Publication Society. London : Pickering ; Burns & Oates ; Richardson. 1869.

Inisfail ; a Lyrical Chronicle of Ireland. By AUBREY DE VERE. Dublin : James Duffy. 1863.

WHEN King Ugony More (how many hundred years before Christ it is not necessary to state precisely) divided his realm of Ireland into twenty-five parts, for the benefit of his twenty-five sons, he compelled his people to swear by "the sun and the moon, the dew, and all elements visible and invisible," that their inheritance should not be taken away from them for ever. If we could fancy that the number of *fuctiunculæ* into which the Irish people are now divided—"splits of splits of splits"—is in any way accounted for by their descent from the subjects of the sons of Ugony, we might suppose that, nineteen hundred years after the birth of Christ, they still consider themselves conscientiously bound by the oath of their Pagan forefathers, and that it is a point of honour and duty with them to keep up at least twenty-five separate parties, and zealously to provide against the possible contingency of their ever becoming again, as they were before King Ugony divided his inheritance, one united people. One thing as certain as it is deplorable is, that while many Irish speakers and writers of great ability are labouring incessantly in the interests of discord, scarcely any prominent patriot of that nation gives evidence of a desire to earn the blessing pronounced upon peacemakers, and to urge his countrymen to union for the good of their common country. The author whose name is at the head of this article is a remarkable and honourable exception in this respect. Mr. Aubrey de Vere has always used his rare gifts and accomplishments in a spirit of conciliation and charity towards all Irishmen, and indeed towards all men. He is not, and we thank God for it, a "good hater." There are so many persons nowadays good for that, and for nothing else, that it is worth while to make a note of the fact. Combining in his origin some of the best elements of the later colonists of Ireland, and not, we believe, without a mixture of the older race, his sympathies are many-sided, and he can feel deeply for the conquered and oppressed,

without, at the same time, rejecting any plea of abatement which it is at all possible to make in favour of those who held the position of oppressors. Born of a Protestant family and educated a Protestant, he chose for himself, in the full vigour of manhood and intellect, the creed of his Catholic countrymen. Accustomed from his earliest years to the best Irish society, in which his father (himself a true poet) held an exceptionally distinguished place, this advantage was still further improved by the associations and culture of an English university and the acquisitions of intelligent and observant travel. He has lived much also amongst his own people, and has witnessed and shared their long days of sorrow as well as their brief moments of rejoicing. He has been a diligent and thoughtful student of the history of Ireland, and has learned from it how many of the country's recent and present evils are to be traced to "English misrule" and how many to "Irish misdeeds." He is deeply imbued with the spirit of ancient Irish literature, and its light is reflected in many of his vivid images, bursts of grief or of triumph, and touches of pathos and of tenderness.

It is not out of place here to bear testimony in passing to Mr. de Vere's contributions, as a political thinker, to the solution of some of the most intricate Irish questions. When the good-tempered and much enduring nobleman, but by no means epigrammatic speaker, who is now (as Mr. Johnston, of Ballykilbeg, said), "by a mysterious dispensation of Providence," ruling over our Indian empire (and, as far as he has got, "ruling it straight"), was charged with having committed himself to a declaration in favour of "levelling up" in Irish ecclesiastical affairs, he very justly repudiated the paternity of the phrase, though he was unsuccessful in relieving himself from the imputation of having professed an intention to adopt the policy. It was Mr. Aubrey de Vere, as all persons correctly informed on the subject know, who first spoke of "levelling up," and who explained and defended that policy, with many forcible arguments and with much persuasive eloquence, in a series of public letters, some years before Lord Mayo said (or did not say) anything about it. His views were shortly afterwards adopted, with some important modifications, by the Bishop of Kerry. They were preferred to those of the present Government by a majority of the House of Lords, including many of the most eminent, calm-judging, and impartial members of that body. That those views did not ultimately prevail is a matter of sufficient notoriety. The principal objection to them was, that—they were objected to; and the objectors were strong enough to carry the day. Though the

settlement proposed by Mr. de Vere was not that which is now on the eve of coming into effect, it would not be true—it would be the reverse of true—to say that he had nothing to do with settling the question. He gave it new life and interest at a time when it was in a state of the most suspended animation, and the credit of having brought it to a, so far, satisfactory issue is fairly his in no small degree.

Reference was made in our pages on a former occasion (April, 1865) to Mr. de Vere's "*Inisfail*"; but, as it was then noticed in connection with the works of several other Irish poets, it did not receive quite as ample a share of attention as its merits entitle it to. It has enjoyed, however, a large measure of popularity, and to its success beyond the Atlantic is probably owing the appearance of the volume published this year for the special behoof of Mr. de Vere's American readers. In the "*Lyrical Chronicle*," he does not simply put the annals of Ireland into rhyme, he does not even treat them in the form of a continuous narrative. The chronicle is, as it claims to be, strictly lyrical; that is to say, the most striking and typical incidents and episodes of Irish history (not throughout its whole extent, fabulous and authentic, Pagan and Christian, but only from the Norman Conquest down to the period immediately preceding Catholic Emancipation) are made the subjects of ballads or lyrical poems. It is divided into three eras, each possessing a distinct historical character. The first, which Mr. de Vere calls the time of the "*Outlawry*," lasted for about three hundred years. "*The Brehon Law*," he says, in a most interesting introduction, "was set aside by the conquering race, and the English law was refused. The weak were the prey of the strong. Yet even in those ages of wrong and rapine all was not suffering. Flowers spring up by the torrent's bed; and many a gay song was sung beneath the invader's fortress. Moreover, in the midst of the Norman settlements, the Gaelic chief held his own, and the old clan life went on as before. Partly through intermarriages, the Norman nobles, in the remoter parts of Ireland, became Irish chiefs, speaking the national language and adopting the national usages." It is obvious that the traditions of such a period are rich in the elements of lyric poetry. We must, however, in candour say that this is the period which Mr. de Vere treats least effectively; and, indeed, he somewhat mars its historical unity by introducing some pieces having reference to a much earlier time. But the death song of the "*Bard Ethell*," ascribed to the thirteenth century, reproduces with extraordinary power and fidelity the sentiments which we can well suppose would

animate such a character. In them are singularly blended the tenets of Christian faith with the traditions of bardic lore and the instincts of Celtic patriotism. Ethell's creed is not much more orthodox than that of the "Northern Farmer," and we have no doubt that something very like it is still held, in wild and remote parts of the country, by some fine old peasants, who in youth were taught their Catechism rather imperfectly. It is impossible to quote it at length, but we cannot refrain from giving a few passages. It begins in this vigorous way:—

I am Ethell, the son of Conn !
 Here I live at the foot of the hill ;
 I am clansman to Brian and servant to none ;
 Whom I hated I hate, whom I loved love still.
 Blind am I. On milk I live,
 And meat (God sends it) on each Saint's Day ;
 Though Donald MacArt—may he never thrive—
 Last Shrovetide drove half my kine away !

After a few more personal reflections, he sings of that Golden Age of Ireland's glory, the reign of King Malachi:—

There never was king, and there never will be,
 In battle or banquet like Malachi !
 The Seers his reign had predicted long ;
 He honoured the bards, and gave gold for song.
 If rebels arose he put out their eyes ;
 If robbers plundered or burned the fanes,
 He hung them in chaplets, like rosaries,
 That others beholding might take more pains !
 There was none to women more reverent-minded,
 For he held his mother, and Mary, dear ;
 If any man wronged them that man he blinded.
 Or straight amerced him of hand or ear.
 There was none who founded more convents—none ;
 In his palace the old and the poor were fed ;
 The orphan might walk, or the widow's son,
 Without groom or page to his throne or bed.
 In his council he mused with great brows divine
 And eyes like the eyes of the musing kine,
 Upholding a sceptre o'er which men said
 Seven Spirits of Wisdom like fire-tongues played,
 He drained ten lakes and he built ten bridges ;
 He bought a gold book for a thousand cows ;
 He slew ten Princes who broke their pledges ;
 With the bribed and the base he scorned to carouse.

He was sweet and awful ; through all his reign
God gave great harvests to vale and plain ;
From his nurse's milk he was kind and brave :
And, when he went down to his well-wept grave,
Through the triumph of penance his soul uprose
To God and the Saints. Not so his foes !

The final recommendation of Ethell's soul is very characteristic. It will remind our readers of the death-bed of Clovis, and his exclamation, when the Passion of our Lord was read to him, "Why was not I there with my brave Sicambrians ?"—

Our hope is Christ. I have wept full oft
He came not to Eire in Oisín's time ;
Though love, and those new monks, would make men soft
If they were not hardened by war and rhyme.
I have done my part : my end draws nigh :
I shall leave old Eire with a smile and sigh :
She will miss not me as I missed my son :
Yet for her, and her praise, were my best deeds done.
Man's deeds ! man's deeds ! They are shades that fleet,
Or ripples like those that break at my feet.
The deeds of my Chief and the deeds of my King
Grow hazy, far seen, like the hills in Spring.
Nothing is great save the Death on the Cross !
But Pilate and Herod I hate, and know
Had Fionn lived then he had laid them low,
Though the world thereby had sustained great loss.
My blindness and deafness and aching back
With meekness I bear for that suffering's sake ;
And the Lent-fast for Mary's sake I love,
And the honour of Him, the Man above !
My songs are all over now : so best !
They are laid in the heavenly Singer's breast
Who never sings but a star is born :
May we hear his song in the endless morn !
* * * * *
I bewail my sins both known and unknown
And of those I have injured forgiveness seek.
The men that were wicked to me and mine ;—
(Not quenching a wrong, nor in war nor wine)
I forgive and absolve them all, save three :—
May Christ in His mercy be kind to me !

The second part of the chronicle of "Inisfail" refers to the period of the wars of religion, which, as the author truly remarks, "completed the union of the Gaelic and Norman

ances." In this part of the work, Mr. de Vere adheres more closely to his plan, and it is also the one in which his muse attains her loftiest flights. Each part has a prologue and epilogue appropriate to the period illustrated. All of those compositions are exceptionally beautiful. One remarkably so, "In the night, in the night," was quoted in our article of April, 1865. In another, the prologue to the second part, there is a solemn sublimity that has in it something of the spirit of *Isaías* or *Ezechiel*. We are not losing sight, of course, of the due distinction between prophetic inspiration and that which is merely poetic. If Mr. de Vere had never written anything else, these lines should suffice to earn for him the crown of bays:—

A voice from the midnight called, "Arise, be alone, and remove thee ;
Descend into valleys of bale, and look on the visions of night ;
From the stranger flee, and be strange to the men and the women that love
thee,
That thy wine may be tears, and that ashes may mix with thy meats of
delight.

"To few is the vision shown, and to none for his weal or from merit :
As lepers they live who see it ; as those that men pity or hate ;
And to few is the voice revealed ; yet to them who hear and can bear it,
Though bitterness cometh at first, yet sweetness cometh more late."

Then in vision I saw a corse—death-cold ; but the angels had draped it
In light ; and the light it cast round the unsealed death-cave was strewn ;
And an anthem rushed o'er the worlds ; but the tongue that moulded and
shaped it
Was a great storm through ruins borne ; and the lips that spake it were
stone.

In the third part the Penal Laws and the "Victory of Endurance" are the themes of the poet's lays. From this part, as well as the second, we should be glad to give many selections if the limits of our space allowed. We are loth to part from this volume, as from an old friend ; but the claims of a new friend, though of the same family, urge themselves on our attention. We may be permitted to observe, before quitting this portion of our pleasant labour, that the hymn of "The Church," with which many London congregations are familiar, is Mr. de Vere's, and is taken from this volume ; and we think it well to add that, in a collection of Catholic hymns for popular use now under our eyes, it is needlessly curtailed, and very incorrectly copied.

The volume which Mr. de Vere has lately published in

America is very appropriately dedicated to Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Both poets have many things in common; above all, they are eminently distinguished by the purity of thought which pervades their works. In the preface, Mr. de Vere has some strong but very just reflections upon a school of poets who have obtained in recent days an undue measure of celebrity, if not of popularity,—those, namely, in whose writings the sensual element predominates. “The fanatics of this school,” he says, “declaim about Passion, but they mean by the word little more than Appetite intellectualized.” He points out in how far different a sense the term was understood by Milton, who, in speaking of poetry as a thing which dealt with the “sensuous” and the “impassioned,” defined “high actions” and “high passions” as those which fitly lay within its province. “The sensual-sensational,” remarks Mr. de Vere, “is essentially the heartless. In it the pathetic has no part. To feel anything it must have nails driven into it. In it love has no part; for it has broken loose from that reverence which is itself but love shrouded beneath her sacred and protecting veil, and from that moral sense from which, and not from the animal nature or a blind caprice, the genuine human affections are outgrowths. In it the imagination has no part—that large and free imagination which aspires to breathe the spiritual into the material, not to merge the former in the latter.” These are truths which possibly will find no echo in the hearts of the writers whose productions are thus characterized, but which, nevertheless, spoken with this simple eloquence, may not be without effect in guiding and correcting the public taste. The pages before us prove, by many an example, how possible it is to give to a poet’s fancies the warmth and colour of passion without releasing them from the restraint of delicacy. Their pathos is not the shriek of physical pain, but the touching outflow of a deep sensibility. In them love is not divorced from reverence, nor the tenderness of human devotion confounded with the workings of brute instinct. The imagination here is that of a refined and elevated mind, not of one depraved and debased.

Te nostræ, Vere, myricæ,

Te nemus omne canet: nec Phœbo gratior ulla est

Quam sibi quæ Veri præscripsit pagina nomen.

By the bye, however, though Virgil’s compliments to his friend Varus need but the change of a letter to be somewhat appropriately quoted here, it is not at all clear that Mr. de Vere is on the best possible terms with Phœbus, whom he thus apostrophizes in “Lines written under Delphi” :—

Phœbus Apollo ! here at thy chief shrine
 From thee I turn ; and stern confession make
 That not the vilest weed yon ripple casts
 Here at my feet, but holds a loftier gift
 Than all the Grecian legends. Let them go—
 Because the mind of man they lifted up,
 But corruptible instincts left to grovel
 On Nature's common plane—yea ! and below it ;
 Because they slightly healed the people's wound :
 And sought in genial fancy, finite hopes,
 Proportioned life, and dialectic art,
 A substitute for virtue ; and because
 They gave for nothing that which Faith should earn,
 Casting the pearls of Truth 'neath bestial feet :—
 Because they washed the outside of the cup,
 And dropped a thin veil o'er the face of Death ;
 Because they neither brought man to his God,
 Nor let him feel his weakness—let them go !
 Wisdom that raises not her sons is folly :
 Truth in its unity alone is Truth.—P. 103.

In the numerous pieces which this volume contains, differing very much in the nature of the subjects and in the manner in which they are treated, there is also, of course, considerable difference in interest and merit. It would be possible to select passages, and even short poems, which, if they stood alone, would hardly seem worthy of the author ; but, judged as a whole, it testifies fairly to Mr. de Vere's poetic genius, and shows that there are few living or coeval competitors in his art from comparison with whom he has any cause to shrink. The keynotes of patriotism and religion are those which he most loves to strike. His poems of the former class contained in this volume refer to the Ireland of to-day, as those in "Inisfail" refer to the Ireland of history. If we could suppose that anything spoken by less than an archangel (if even by one) could find a large audience of sober listeners in Ireland at this moment, we should have more confidence in recommending Mr. de Vere's ideas and reflections to the notice of his countrymen. He deals with the questions of the time in an earnest and hopeful spirit, not unaffected by the shadow of the cloud, yet ever looking forward to the brightness reflected in its "silver lining." We need not refer to the poems in which the Church question (now set at rest) is alluded to, and it is principally in illustration of that that the question of Tenant-right is discussed. The right sort of song for the time seems to be Ode III., entitled—

INDUSTRY.

Free children of a land set free,
A land late bound in fetters,
Demand ye why your critic guest
Scoffs oft in you his betters ?
Nor race alone, nor creed to him
Is stumbling-block or scandal :
Your rags offend ! he loathes in you
Light purse and slipshod sandal.

His virtue builds on self-respect :
Upon that clay foundation,
Nor rock nor sand, his trophies stand,
The unit and the nation.
Sad martyr of a finite hope,
Nor seeks he, nor attains he
The all-heavenly prize. He toils for earth ;
But what he seeks that gains he.

Grasp ye, with ampler aim, that good
His tragic creed o'erprizes :
With loftier mind revere in him
The will that energizes,
The strong right hand, the lion heart,
The industrial truth and valour :
When comes reverse he too can die,
But not in dirt and squalor.

The natural virtues yield to those
Of heavenly birth affiance :
O, ye so strong in faith, be strong
In truth and self-reliance !
Strength, justice, prudence, self-constraint !
Behold the four-square turret
From which—a triad spire—should rise
The virtues of the Spirit !

* * * *

Son of the sorrowing isle, her eyes
Arraign thee for unkindness !
Her shipless seas, her stagnant moors
Accuse thy sloth or blindness.
Set free her greatness ; sing to her,
New harvests waving round thee,
“ Thy son with golden robe hath girt,
With golden crown hath crowned thee ! ”

* * * *

Advance, victorious years ! we land
 On solid shores and stable :
 Recede, dim seas, and painted cloud
 Of legend and of fable !
 The Heroic Age returns. Of old
 Men fought with spears and arrows :—
 The sea-bank is the shield to-day :
 The true knight drains and harrows !—Pp. 23–26.

One of the longest poems in the book, and, we think, the finest, is called "The Sisters." The heroine seems to be drawn from the life. In no nature more fully than the Irish is displayed the power of faith in hours of trial; in none more fully than that of Irish women is verified the Apostle's saying, *Virtus in infirmitate perficitur*. The character of Mary MacCarthy is a beautiful illustration of this divine truth. But before we attempt a brief analysis of the poem, we must say a word about the manner of its introduction. The author discusses with an English friend who is visiting him the question of the condition of Ireland. The Englishman is wrathfully eloquent in his denunciation of everything he sees—unreclaimed lands, broken-down gates, ill-thatched hovels, rutty roads, feasts and fasts, wakes and weddings, and (worst of all) cripples at holy wells. His host speaks him gently; politely pretermits England's responsibility for some of these results; urges the authority of *Quærite primum*; admits that England's destiny is great, but mildly hints that Ireland's is greater, inasmuch as Heaven is better worth striving for than earth. To soothe him, however, he sings in high strains of fair and storied England; and our English readers will probably thank us for quoting the passage, which reminds one of Virgil's noble lines ("Sed neque Medorum, &c.") in the second Georgic, imitated successfully though with too much diffuseness in Thomson's "Summer":—

He loved his country ;
 An older man than he for things less great
 Had loved her less. Yet who could gaze, unmoved,
 From Windsor's terraced heights o'er those broad meads
 Lit by the pomp of silver-winding Thames,
 Dropping past templed grove, and hall, and farm,
 Toward the great city ? Who, unthrilled, could mark
 Her minsters, towering far away, with heads
 That stay the sunset of old times ; or them,
 Oxford and Cambridge, England's anchors twain,
 That to her moorings hold her ? Fresh from these
 Who, who could tread, O Wye, thy watery vale,

Where Tintern reigns in ruin ; who could rest
Where Bolton finds in Wharf a warbling choir,
Or where the sea-wind fans thy brow discrowned,
Furness, nor love and wonder ? Who, untouched,
When evening creeps from Scawfell toward Black Combe,
Could wander by thy darkly gleaming lakes,
Embayed 'mid sylvan garniture, and isles
From saint or anchoret named, within the embrace
Of rural mountains green, or sound, scent, touch,
Of kine-besprinkled, soft, partition'd vales,
Almost domestic ? Shadow-haunted land !
By Southey's lake Saint Herbert holds his own !
The knightly armour now by Yewdale's crag
Rings loud no longer ; Grasmere's reddening glass
Reflects no more the on-rushing clan ; yet still
Thy Saxon kings and ever-virgin queens
Possess thee with a quiet pathos ; still,
Like tarnished path forlorn of moon that sets
Over wide-watered moor and marsh, thy Past,
A spiritual sceptre, though deposed, extends
From sea to sea—from century-worn St. Bees
To Cuthbert's tomb under those eastern towers
On Durham's bowery steep !—Pp. 163-4.

Examining more closely for himself the traces of ruin wrought by misrule, the stranger's candid mind experiences a revulsion. He now begins to lay the blame where the chief part of it undoubtedly should rest, on those who, having had the mastery in the isle for seven hundred years, could do no better than leave such a cruel botchery after them. Then his host, starting from the reflection, that

The history of a soul holds in it more
Than doth a nation's,

unfolds his simple tale. The sisters were Irish peasant girls, left orphans in early childhood, and taken to the home of their grandmother. Their characters are well contrasted ; the elder active, quick, industrious,

Kept the house ;
Hers was the rosier cheek, the livelier mind,
The smile of readier cheer.

The younger sister was of a different mood ; pensive and solitary ; prone to indolence

And self-indulgence, not that coarser sort
Which seeks delight, but that which shuns annoy.

She was not idle, however, but, while her bustling sister ruled the dairy, the spinning-wheel was Mary's favourite employment. This picture of domestic peace soon gives way to a scene of horror.

Sudden fell

Famine, the terror never absent long,
Upon our land. It shrank—the daily dole ;
The oatmeal trickled from a tighter grasp ;
Hunger grew wild through panic ; infant cries
Maddened at times the gentle into wrong :
Death's gentleness more oft for death made way ;
And like a lamb that openeth not its mouth
The sacrificial people, fillet-bound,
Stood up to die. Amid inviolate herds
Thousands the Sacraments of death received,
Then waited God's decree. These things are known :
Strangers have witnessed to them ; strangers writ
The epitaph again and yet again.
The nettles and the weeds by the wayside
Men ate : from sharpening features and sunk eyes
Hunger glared forth, a wolf more lean each hour ;
Children seemed pigmies shrivelled to sudden age ;
And the deserted babe, too weak to wail,
But shook its hands, pitying or curious, raised
The rag across him thrown. In England alms
From many a private hearth were largely sent,
As oft-times they have been. 'Twas vain. The land
Wept while her sons sank back into their graves
Like drowners 'mid still seas.—P. 174.

Flying from the stricken land, Mary is on her way to America, when she falls sick of fever at Liverpool. On her recovery, she meets with an aged priest, who is her kinsman by the mother's side, and is persuaded by him to renounce the idea of going further. She settles herself with some friends outside the city, and, while employed in the gardens, attracts the notice of a young man of prosperous condition, who becomes her suitor.

Her country was his own : he loved it not ;
Had rooted quickly in the stranger's land ;
And versatile, cordial, specious, seeming-frank,
Contracting for himself a separate peace,
Had prospered, but had prospered in such sort
As they that starve within. Her confidence
He gained. To love unworthy, still he loved her :
Loved with the love of an unloving heart—

That love which either is in shallows lost,
Or in its black depth breeds the poison weed.
She knew him not ; how could she ? He himself
Knew scantily. Near her what was best within him
Her golden smile sunn'd forth ; but, dark and cold,
Like a benighted hemisphere abode
A moiety of his being which she saw not.
His was a superficial nature, vain
And hard, to good impressions sensitive,
And most admiring virtues least his own ;
*A mirror that took in a seeming world,
And yet remained blank surface.*—P. 176.

This man's attachment is not proof against the promise of a fortune offered him by an uncle, who had lost the last of his own children, and called his nephew home to be his heir, but to wed another bride. When he appeals to his betrothed for "counsel" in this difficulty, she scornfully releases him ; and she returns unopened a letter which, in a tardily repentant mood, he had written to her. Afterwards, when early affliction comes upon him, she bewails her pride. But hers was—

That wrath of tender hearts, which scorns
Revenge, which scarcely utters its complaint,
And yet forgives but slowly.—P. 178.

After this trial, Mary's longings to journey further on return again. She crosses the Atlantic, passes from place to place, not unhappy, yet not feeling as if at home, until at last sickness again seizes her in a Southern city. After her recovery, in a moment of sadness and desolation, she is met by a nun, who persuades her to enter her own convent, where, as a lay sister, she at length finds peace and joy. There are some beautiful lines descriptive of the religious life, of which we can give but a few :—

From the vow
Which bound the will's infinitude to God,
Upwelled that peaceful strength whose fount was God :
From Him behind His sacramental veil
In holy passion for long hours adored,
Came that great love which made the bonds of earth
Needless, thence irksome. Wondering, there she learned
The creature was not for the creature made,
But for the sole Creator ; that His kingdom,
Glorious hereafter, lies around us here,
Its visible splendour painfully suppressing,
And waiting its transfiguration.—Pp. 182-3.

From this life of happiness Mary is disturbed by a summons from her sister, who had married and gone to a home of her own, leaving the aged grandmother, who had been the support of their childhood, without the attendance she so much needed. Mary is called back to Ireland, and, after a hard struggle, resolves to go. It will perhaps have seemed that we have drawn more largely from the text than is usual in notices of this kind; but the extraordinary beauty of the poem would justify much more copious extracts. We cannot leave it without giving some lines from the description of Mary's life in its last period, after her return home:—

And so once more she trod this rocky vale,
 And scarcely older looked at twenty-six
 Than at sixteen. Before so gentle, now
 A humbler gentleness was o'er her thrown;
 Nor ruffled was she ever as of yore
 With gusts of flying spleen; nor feared she now
 Hindrance unlovely, or the word that jarred.
 The sadness hers at first dispersed ere long,
 And such strange sweetness came to her, men said
A mad dog would not bite her.

* * * *

At heart

Ever a nun, she ministered with looks
 That healed the sick. The newly-widow'd door
 Its gloom remitted when she passed; stern foes
 Down trod their legend of old wrongs. To her,
 Sacred were those that grieved;—those tearless yet
 Sacred scarce less because they smiled, nor knew
 The ambushed fate before them. When a child,
 Grey-haired companionship or solitude
 Had pleased her more than childish ways; but now,
 All the long eves of summer in the porch
 The children of her sister and the neighbours,
 A spotless flock, sat round her. From her smiles
 The sluggish mind caught light, the timid heart
 Courage and strength. Unconscious thus, each day
 Her soft and blithesome feet one letter traced
 In God's great Book above. So passed her life;—
 Sorrow had o'er it hung a gentle cloud;
 But, like an autumn-mocking day in spring,
 Dewy and dim, yet ending in pure gold,
 The sweets were sweeter for the rain, the growth
 Stronger for shadow.—Pp. 184-6.

Many of the shorter pieces are perfect in their way. Here is one that will wed itself naturally to some graceful and

pathetic melody. All sorts of composers have been doing, and overdoing, Longfellow in this way. Will not some one try his hand at this?—

LINES.

Only a reed that sighed :—
And the poplar grove hard by
From a million of babbling mouths replied :
“ Who cares, who cares ? Not I ! ”

Only a dove's low moan :—
And the new-gorged raven near
Let fall from the red beak the last white bone,
And answered, half croak, half sneer.

The pale, still face too soon
Was paler, stiller thrice :
And ere the rose burst in the breast of June,
The young, warm heart was ice.— P. 266.

We have but one extract more to give. We could not omit it now, when all men's eyes, whether they will or no, are turned in one direction. It is taken from the piece entitled “ A Wanderer's Musings at Rome ” :—

Hark that peal !
From countless domes that high in sunlight shake,
A thousand bells roll forth their harmonies :
The City, by the noontide flame oppressed,
And sheltered long in sleep, awakes. Even now,
Along the Pincian steep, with youthful step
To dignity subdued, collegiate trains
Precede their grave preceptors. Courts grass-grown,
That echoed long some fountain's lonely splash,
Now ring more loudly ; by the red wheels dinned
Of prince or prelate of the Church, intent
On some majestic rite. That peal again !
And now the linked procession moves abroad,
Untwining slowly its voluminous folds :
It pauses—through the dusky archway drawn ;
It vanishes—upcoiled at last, and still,
Girdling the Coliseum's central Cross,
The sacred pageant rests. With stealthy motion,
So slid the Esculapian snake of old
Forth from the darkness. In Hesperian isle
So rested, coiled along the mystic stein,
The watcher of the fruit. The day draws on :
The multitudinous thrill of quickening life
Vibrates through all the city, while its blood

Flows back from vein to vein. That sound prevails
 In convent walks by rustling robe trailed o'er ;
 Like hum of insects, unbeheld it throbs
 Through orange-scented cloistral gardens dim ;
 It deepens with the concourse onward borne
 Between those statued saints that guard thy bridge,
 St. Angelo, and past the Adrian Tomb,
 Where at the Church's feet an Empire sleeps ;
 It swells within those colonnades whose arms
 Receive once more the concourse from all lands—
 The lofty English noble, student pale
 From Germany, diplomatist from France,
 Far Grecian patriarch, or Armenian priest,
 Or Royal exile. From thy marble roofs,
 St. Peter's, in whose fastnesses abide,
 Like Arab tribes encamped, the band ordained
 To guard them from the aggressive elements—
 From those ærial roofs and whispering depths
 Of crypts where kneels the cowl'd monk alone ;
 The murmur spreads like one broad wind that lifts
 Ere morn the sighing shrouds of fleet becalmed :
 The churches fill, the relics forth are brought :
 Screened by rich fretwork, the monastic apse
 Resounds the hoarse chant, like an ocean cave :
 And long ere yet those obelisks, which once
 Shadowed the Nile, o'er courts Basilican
 Project their evening shades, like silver stars
 Before white altars glimmering lights shall burn,
 And solitary suppliants lift their hands
 To Christ, for ever present, to His Saints,
 And to His Martyrs, whom the catacombs
 Hide in their sunless bosoms.

Rome, O Rome !

Surely thy strength is here.—Pp. 117-119.

If the tendency of Catholic criticism amongst us has sometimes been towards an exaggerated appreciation of the works of contemporary Catholic writers, that is not a reason why we should rush into the opposite extreme, and shrink from giving all the praise that is due to men of rare genius and culture, when, spurning the fame that might be cheaply won by following the current of popular favour, they bravely labour, amid much discouragement, and with little or no earthly recompense, for such ends only as their conscience approves. We do not hesitate, therefore, to claim for Mr. de Vere the widest and most welcoming audiences among those of our body—and we know they are very many—to whose hours of leisure a high and pure literature brings a refreshment and solace only in-

ferior to that which comes, at times of graver thought, from holier influences. For "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," they need not have recourse to sources tainted by falsehood and corruption, while writers such as he can fill their minds with noble conceptions and graceful images, steeped in the golden glow of faith and resplendent with the silvery sheen of purity.

ART. V.—FATHER FABER'S WORK IN THE CHURCH.

Devotion to the Pope and Devotion to the Church. By the late FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, D.D. Third edition.

NOT many men leave vestiges of their passage through the world. Of those who do, a majority would probably desire, if it were possible, to efface them. But this craving for oblivion, whether suggested by remorse or inspired by humility, is always doomed to disappointment. The world refuses to forget, however unwisely it may appreciate, actions of a certain weight and gravity, especially those of which the effect survives the performers. Such actions, considered in their results, form the most critical chapters in the history of the human family. They belong to the universal record. They colour the thoughts of many generations, and when they prove to be the germs of new systems, or become embodied in new institutions, they endure as long as the races by whom the latter are adopted. But if certain actions acquire an inevitable immortality, it is not always those which have had most influence in shaping the destinies of men which fill the largest place in their memory, or continue to attract their gratitude. In the ceaseless conflict between good and evil, which begins anew every day, the most signal benefactors of human society are often supplanted in popular esteem by others who had bequeathed to posterity only a legacy of crimes or errors, and whose new maxims are approved the more eagerly, because they tend to discredit ancient services which the foolish world no longer values, and desires to forget. It wishes to obliterate memories which have become a reproach, and rudely cancels obligations which it has resolved not to recognize. If Popes and Bishops, acting in person or by the instrumentality of religious communities, have been in every age the conservators of all the good which is still to be found in the world, and the principal architects of that peculiar civilization which distinguishes Christian nations from the heathen societies of old, their claim to our gratitude is not likely to be admitted by men who are conspiring to

corrupt that civilization, to assimilate it to pagan types, and to limit, with that object, ecclesiastical influence within so narrow a field, that it shall neither be able to perpetuate its own creations, nor to combat those which the world proposes to substitute for them.

But if the world forgets or disparages its benefactors, Christians see in this ingratitude only an additional motive for exalting them. To refuse to such men the homage of love and respect, is to refuse it to Him from whom they received their gifts. Others have lived for themselves, but these for all mankind. And though this is true in the most eminent degree only of the few whose actions have become a monument for all time, it applies in a lower sense to every workman of their class, who, in his own day and in his own measure, has freely chosen to be the servant of his brethren, has consented to postpone all thought of personal ease and comfort to another life, and resolved to make the glory of God and the salvation of souls the only aim and purpose of his existence. It is a decisive proof of the perpetual presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, that, in every land, and in every generation, men of this heroic temper abound. They are at least as numerous in our own time, in spite of the contrary phenomena which some regard so despondingly, as at any epoch since the Apostolic age. Perhaps their number has never been so great. To say nothing of saints, nor of the vast army of religious who dedicate their whole life by a solemn vow to a ministry of love and sacrifice, nor of the multitude of lay persons who now emulate in the world virtues which were once deemed peculiar to the cloister,—every one duly called and elected to the ecclesiastical state, and faithful to all which that vocation implies, is of the school of the Apostles, and, in proportion to his gifts, a continuator of their work. What good princes and wise statesmen are in the temporal order, to compare small things with great, such men are in the spiritual. They are, like their predecessors, the only real and permanent benefactors of the human race. No labours which secular zeal can initiate, or natural benevolence inspire, may be compared with theirs, because they spring from lower motives, and are directed to lower ends. If such efforts, which always end in total or partial failure, and are constantly renewed only to lead again to the same results, were as effectual as, in fact, they are weak and unproductive, they would still accomplish only temporal good, and promote only transient interests. They do not so much as profess to have any supernatural aim, and a well-known organ of English rationalists has lately announced, as if it were a self-evident truth, that “modern philanthropy and Christianity are two things *fundamentally opposed to each other.*” *

* *Pall Mall Gazette*, October 12, 1869.

It is, then, natural and congruous, that all who prefer Christianity to "modern philanthropy," both on account of its origin and history, of what it *has* done and what it is likely to do, should offer to the spiritual and ecclesiastical benefactors, whom they regard as the "salt of the earth," the grateful esteem which the world refuses to them. But among these benefactors they distinguish, not without reason, those whose ministry has presented no special feature, and has been profitable chiefly to the few with whom they had personal relations, and others whose work is destined to live after them, and who, from circumstances peculiar to their time and country, have been instruments of Divine Providence in a task of immeasurably wider dimensions, but of which their own humility did not always allow them to appreciate the magnitude. To give an example of the distinction referred to, we may ask, which of the great preachers of the age of Louis XIV., with the single exception of Bossuet, though a whole generation hung upon their lips, now exerts any appreciable influence upon human thought or action? On the other hand, the modest founder of S. Sulpice still lives, on both sides of the Atlantic, in the institutions which owe their being to his initiative. He was one of those who laboured, not for one, but for many generations. We believe that Father Faber was a workman of this class, and if we succeed in proving, as we hope to do, that the fact has been admitted by those whose judgment is least liable to error, including the Sovereign Pontiff himself, we shall have endeavoured to discharge our own share of the common debt of gratitude which English Catholics owe to the author of "*The Creator and the Creature*."

In order to appreciate duly Father Faber's work in the Church, it is necessary to consider what was the condition of religion in this country when he commenced his ministry. To understand what he did, we must first apprehend clearly what he had to do. If this obliges us to revive unwelcome memories, and to recall a period so unlike our own that we have some difficulty in realizing it, what is painful in this dismal retrospect will be fully compensated by the more unclouded view which we shall obtain of our actual blessings and privileges, as well as of the process by which they have been acquired. Perhaps we shall learn at the same time how they may be most securely perpetuated.

Let it be observed, since we are about to recall an epoch which is in some respects the least satisfactory in the annals of English Catholics, that it will be prudent to speak gently of faults which, if our own lot had been cast in that gloomy time, we should doubtless have shared. For more than two centuries the English Government, always aided, and often stimulated, by the bishops and clergy of the established sect, had endeavoured, with a truly diabolical perseverance, to root out every vestige of the Catholic faith. "The

criminal code of England," as a Protestant writer has recently remarked, "was, until the time of Sir Samuel Romilly, the bloodiest in Europe"; and the most ferocious articles of that exceptionally ferocious code were directed against her Catholic citizens. At the beginning of the present century, this long persecution had been so far successful, that the number of English Catholics had been reduced to a few thousands. During the greater part of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, England had become, and had remained, almost a heathen country, and the attempts which were made from time to time, whether by members of the Establishment or of other Protestant sects, to revive certain elementary Christian principles, only served to prove how universal was the spiritual trance which had fallen upon the people. But such attempts were almost always independent of the State Church, and a reaction against her lethargy and corruption. "It is an unquestionable and most instructive fact," says Lord Macaulay,* "that the years during which the political power of the Anglican hierarchy was in the zenith were precisely the years during which national virtue was at the lowest point." It was this astonishing spectacle of a once Christian nation fallen into practical heathenism which suggested to one French writer the well-known definition of Protestantism, "*C'est le paganisme moins ses dieux*"; and led another to ask, in spite of the partial improvement which has followed the recent revival of Catholic principles, "*Qui douterait à première vue que les Anglais aient un culte?*"† In the midst of such a people as this, the great majority of whom were literally living "without God in the world," a few thousand Catholics, at the beginning of the present century, were the sole witnesses of that ancient faith which England had cast out. But amid the general decay of dogmatic, and even, to a considerable extent, of natural religion, the national spirit of hostility to that faith was still active and implacable. The condition of the primitive Christians with relation to the civil power was hardly more intolerable than that of English Catholics had been during many successive generations. Once they had asked the Holy See whether, on certain days of the year, they might feign an outward conformity with the State-religion, in order to save life and goods, and the answer had been in the negative. So notorious throughout Christendom were their sufferings, that when the Spanish ambassador at Rome heard a rumour, during one of the later sessions of the Council of Trent, that some of the Fathers proposed to insert a decree anathematizing the "pretended Anglican bishops," he argued against the expediency of such a decree on this account:—"All

* History of England, c. ii.

† *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Dec. 15, 1865.

the world knows," he says, "that Anglican bishops are impostors ; but if you exasperate the English Government, you will only make the position of the English Catholics still more intolerable than it is already." And even when the hour at length arrived which removed from the children of the martyrs a portion of the burden which their fathers had endured, and policy rather than sympathy mitigated the sufferings of Catholics, they were still subject to pitiless social proscription. We have been assured by an aged Catholic, whose personal distinction made him a favourite in Protestant society, that most of his friends never suspected that he was a Catholic, and would have broken all relations with him if they had known it. Others, it is to be feared, did not scruple to make still more dangerous concessions to the world, in order to enjoy a share of its favours. They assisted in secret at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and approached from time to time the Sacrament of Penance ; but, far from consenting to "give a reason for the faith that was in them," their Protestant associates could scoff at that faith with impunity in the presence of such discreet professors. Speaking generally, it was only in the private houses of the few wealthy or noble Catholics that religion removed the veil from her face, and if in still darker times such houses had been almost the sole refuge of the persecuted faith, a deep conviction of the injury which it too often suffered in their close atmosphere obliges us to confess that the protection was sometimes dearly purchased. There were, indeed, many noble exceptions, and it would not be difficult to give a long list of familiar Catholic names, among which two or three still known among us would frequently recur, by whom our holy faith was honoured in a generous and valiant spirit. It would be a grateful task to enumerate those who wisely gloried in being the servants, without affecting to be the patrons, of that divine religion which accomplished its countless victories before they came into being, and will still be renewing them when they are forgotten. But there were others of a different complexion. Feebly endowed with mental gifts, imperfectly educated, and incapable of any noble ambition ; often induced by their very isolation, as well as by the original littleness of their character, to exaggerate the petty social maxims and vulgar prejudices of their class ; offering a shelter to the proscribed priest rather because they had large houses than large minds, and often tempting him to doubt whether it would not be wiser to remove elsewhere the tender plant which his vocation obliged him to cherish and cultivate, even at the risk of exposing it to the rude storm which raged outside his uncongenial home ; it is not surprising that religion, at length emancipated from such sorry tutelage, came forth sickly in constitution, dwarfed and crippled in some of its limbs, and shining only with a pale and intermittent light. In

a recent review of the excellent life of Father Faber by one of his own congregation, we noticed some examples of the grotesque compromise which certain English Catholics had made with the world around them. Who can remember without shame the day when a Charles Butler was the representative of a group of such Catholics, and a thorn in the side of the venerable Milner? We should be tempted to laugh, if the recollection were not suggestive of other feelings than mirth, when we are told of churches in which the Litany of our Lady had not been publicly recited for many years, "for fear of offending Protestants"! "You converts are so enthusiastic," said the amiable wife of a Catholic peer, with a deprecating smile, to one who lamented that in England devotion to the Mother of God had shrunk to such narrow dimensions. It was Catholics of this sort who openly disapproved the restoration of the Hierarchy, lest it should disturb their tranquil relations with their wealthy Protestant neighbours. They had consorted so long with the world on its own terms, that they had learned to respect its judgments, and to fear its frown. And we know, by abundant evidence, to what they had reduced the practice of the religion of S. Anselm and S. Thomas. "Why do you complain," was the witty retort of a well-known ecclesiastic, to one who was vexed because some Protestant *gamin* had chalked the words "*No Popery*" on the walls of his church; "*he has only written the truth?*" But we need not dwell longer upon the disastrous results of an epoch now happily passed away. A new era has commenced for the Church in England, and two men were raised up by Divine Providence to rebuild the temple which centuries of oppression and violence had shaken to its foundations, but of which neither the world nor the devil could prevent the restoration.

When he who was afterwards the illustrious Cardinal Wiseman was first appointed by the Holy See coadjutor to the saintly Bishop Walsh, we are informed that he bound his soul before God to the faithful observance of these four resolutions in the career upon which he was about to enter: (1) to labour always to promote the honour of Jesus in the Most Holy Sacrament; (2) to revive an ardent devotion to the Mother of God; (3) to do all in his power to multiply religious communities; and (4) to establish in England a society for the conversion of the heathen. If we add that it was further his purpose to encourage in English Catholics a tender veneration towards the Sovereign Pontiff, and a constant sense of his claims to their loving obedience, we shall have enumerated the objects which were especially present to the mind, and dear to the heart of this great prelate. Often have we heard from his own lips, both while he was still Rector of Oscott and at a later period, language which indicated how consistently he applied himself to what we may perhaps venture to style the peculiar mission to which

he deemed himself called. How ably and faithfully he discharged it, there is no need to tell. We are all profiting at this hour by his labours. We see, too, more and more clearly, to what end they were directed. For him there were no "foreigners" in the Church. He thought that what was true in Italy or Spain was equally true in England or America. If certain Italian devotions, which had been practised under the very eye of a long succession of holy pontiffs, and had assisted a multitude of souls to attain closer union with God, were distasteful to the English, so much the worse, in his judgment, for the English. It was precisely in order to extend and popularize such salutary devotions, which Father Faber was afterwards to recommend with irresistible persuasiveness, that Cardinal Wiseman, as we know from his own assurance, welcomed the arrival in his province of foreign ecclesiastics, every addition to whose number, whether they came from France, Italy, Belgium, or Spain, was one of his dearest consolations. And if he spoke always of the lingering prejudices and local or national prepossessions which he did so much to discourage and eradicate, with a reserve which belonged both to his character and his office, none who approached him could have any doubt how repugnant they were to his spiritual instincts. As for those who openly avowed such insular partialities, they were rather charitably endured than spontaneously welcomed by him. But, much as we owe him for his share in the auspicious revival in which he bore so conspicuous a part, the very greatness of his position set limits to his personal action, and obliged him to delegate to others the completion of the work of which he laid the foundation. His labour was to be supplemented by a man whom the providence of God had prepared for this special task, and whose station and gifts were exactly what its successful prosecution required. That man was Frederick William Faber.

In attempting, as we shall now do, to estimate Father Faber's work in the Church, not only we have no pretension to speak with any semblance of authority, but we desire to submit all our appreciations, on this as on every kindred topic, to the correction of those who do. We shall begin by avowing our undoubting conviction that the "personal influence" of Father Faber, great as it was, contributed much less to the success of the work which he accomplished than some have deemed. Agreeing most cordially with his illustrious friend Dr. Newman in our admiration of "his remarkable gifts, his poetical fancy, his engaging frankness, his playful wit, his affectionateness, his sensitive piety," and whatever else belonged to that harmonious assemblage of beautiful qualities, of which none who knew him could fail to feel the charm, and which many adversaries of the Church have generously recognized, we are quite unable to admit that they account for the place which

he fills in innumerable devout hearts which beat in far-off climes, and the influence which he exerts in lands where his presence was never seen. . We are able to attest, as a result of personal observation, that on the other side of the Atlantic, and in the bosom of Christian families instructed by his glowing words, his name is a household word, both among young and old. There can be no question here of "personal influence." "If there is any good in me, or any profitable love of God and the Church," said an American priest to us a few months ago, "I owe it in a great measure to Father Faber, and the longer I live the more I feel the debt." It was often enough, in any society of lay American Catholics, to say, "I knew Father Faber," to excite an outburst of grateful sympathy towards him whom they honoured as a common benefactor, and who had long been to many of them a kind of invisible director. And in this there was no sentimental enthusiasm for the poet, but only a profound sentiment of thankfulness to the spiritual writer. In such facts, which might be gathered abundantly in many other countries, we have often been able to detect—and have taken some pains to do so—the most decisive evidence that what the more earnest Christians of other lands chiefly appreciated in Father Faber's books, and most eagerly appropriated, was precisely his exposition of certain truths which, though "portions of our Lord's Gospel," to use his own words, had in a few places become momentarily obscured, to the great injury of souls. Among these were the constant worshipful exaltation of the Most Holy Sacrament, devotion to the Mother of God and the Vicar of Christ, and habitual recourse to that treasury of indulgences of which the Church holds the key, and which she daily unlocks for the satisfaction of our private needs, and the solace of the holy souls in purgatory. We think it cannot be denied that, among English-speaking Catholics, Father Faber has been the chief and most efficient agent, not only in recommending such truths and devotions, but in creating an experimental conviction, constantly growing in the hearts of those who have been formed by his teaching, that wherever they are coldly welcomed, all hope of resembling the saints is but vanity and delusion. "We hope," says a distinguished American ecclesiastic, in his preface to one of Father Faber's works, "that the abundant blessing of Heaven will rest on the teachings of such a guide. The most earnest language would but faintly express our sentiments of gratitude towards him. If the power to conceive and convey to others the most sublime, and at the same time the most practical, truths that can interest the human mind, be a title to the homage of men, then has Father Faber established for himself a claim which no length of years nor change of circumstances can efface." And then he adds what Father Faber himself would have considered the most precious eulogy which human lips

could pronounce: "Few writers since the days of S. Francis de Sales have made more Christian hearts bow in loving adoration before our tabernacles than the author of "All for Jesus" and "The Blessed Sacrament."* Once more: "Who can withhold the homage due to such a servant of the Church? It may be excess of admiration for genius, learning, wisdom, zeal, piety,—all combined in one noble soul; or is it the depth of our gratitude to the Father of mercies and the God of all consolation, from whom every good and perfect gift descendeth, that sways our judgment when we say that *not for several ages past* has God given to His Church a teacher, whose thoughts of love and words of light will fall, like Heaven's dew, on a wider extent of that field in which the Son of God Himself laboured and still labours for the salvation of souls? . . . Who can estimate the salutary influence exercised in our country *over a multitude of souls*, from the cloistered nun, with her group of gay young worldlings around her, to the aged missionary, with his humble flock, by those two wonderful books, "All for Jesus" and "The Blessed Sacrament"? No one questions it. It may sound to some like adulation; but still we say that in the treatise before us, "The Creator and the Creature," as well as in the three works that have preceded it, and made the name of Father Faber *dear to myriads*, there are chapters which re-echo in our day the sweetness of S. Bernard, the wit and erudition of S. Jerome, the eloquence of S. John Chrysostom, the philosophy of S. Augustine."

Although it is impossible to add force and energy to such words as these, we ask permission to quote a few lines addressed "to Frederick William Faber, D.D.," in the first page of the same American volume, for a special reason, which shall be stated immediately:—

Some angel, such as Mercy sends to win
All hearts to love, most surely was thy guest,
Thy thoughts, thy words inspired: his fragrant wings
In rapture waved o'er thee and thy abode,
Friend of the weary heart in search of God!
As 'mid life's glittering waste, like joyous springs,
Thy works came forth. Men own the treasure given:
Bless thee and God: and journey on to Heaven.

The graceful verses of which these form a part bear the signature of Father E. J. Saurin, of the Society of Jesus, and are dated "Loyola College, Baltimore"; and the volume itself is published "with the approbation of the Most Reverend Archbishop of Baltimore." Now Loyola College is one of the great centres of

* Preface to American edition of "The Creator and the Creature."

religious life in the United States ; and no one whose privilege it has been to know that noble institution, and to hold converse with the community by whose labours it is sustained, can doubt either that they are representatives of all which is purest and most elevated in the American Church, or that their judgment would be accepted with acclamation by American Catholics. We are witnesses that the fathers of Loyola College, among whom is found one who resigned the episcopal dignity to labour humbly with the children of S. Ignatius, enjoy the love and respect which such men do not seek but cannot escape ; and that the homage which they offer to Father Faber is as precious a tribute as any with which the sympathy of his fellows could attest his worth or adorn his memory.

We have quoted with the more satisfaction these testimonies of American priests because we know that they reflect the universal sentiment both of the clergy and laity of the United States. It is surely worthy of observation that in that great Republic, where no traditions of the past contend, as in England, with the anarchical principles which Protestantism has introduced into the world, and where each unit of the vast confederation which calls itself "the sovereign people" claims to exercise an independent judgment on all things human and divine, all who profess the ancient faith, whether nursed from infancy in the bosom of the Church or converted in mature age, are what it is the fashion among ourselves to call Ultramontanes. Never have we heard more tender and filial expressions towards the Holy Father, nor witnessed more ardent sympathy with those doctrines and devotions which Father Faber lived to propagate, than among the free citizens of the American Union. If the zealous and intelligent clergy of the United States were all ministering in the cities and hamlets of Italy, or the congregations whom they serve were all dispersed in the villages of France or Spain, they would have nothing to learn and nothing to forget. They would be as much at home in the churches of Rome, Paris, or Madrid, as in those of Baltimore, Cincinnati, or San Francisco. What people have more lovingly condoled with Pius IX. in all his tribulations, or more generously contributed to his wants, than American Catholics ? And these republicans, among whom have already been distributed more than fifty thousand copies of Father Faber's works, would adopt with their whole heart and mind, and repeat with acclamation, from the shores of the Atlantic to those of the Pacific, the solemn words which we now ask permission to quote, both as an example of how Father Faber taught, and of the lessons which such disciples have embraced with thoughtful and deliberate approval :—

The Pope is the Vicar of Jesus on earth, and enjoys among the monarchs of the world all the rights and sovereignties of the sacred humanity of Jesus.

No crown can be above his crown. By divine right he can be subject to none. All subjection is a violence and a persecution. He is a monarch by the very force of his office, for of all kings he is the highest to the King of kings. He is the visible shadow cast by the Invisible Head of the Church in the Blessed Sacrament. His office is an institution emanating from the same depth of the Sacred Heart, out of which we have already seen the Blessed Sacrament and the elevation of the poor and of children take their rise. It is a manifestation of the same love, an exposition of the same principle. With what carefulness, then, with what reverence, with what exceeding loyalty, ought we not to correspond to so magnificent a grace, to so marvellous a love, as this which our dearest Saviour has shown us in His choice and institution of His earthly Vicar! Peter lives always, because the Three-and-Thirty Years are always going on. The two truths belong to each other. The Pope is to us in all our conduct what the Blessed Sacrament is to us in all our adoration. The mystery of His Vicariate is akin to the mystery of the Blessed Sacrament. The two mysteries are intertwined.

And what is the practical conclusion, as freely accepted by men living under democratic as under monarchical institutions, which Father Faber urges upon the men of his generation? "It is no less than this:—that devotion to the Pope is an essential part of all Christian piety. It is not a matter which stands apart from the spiritual life, as if the Papacy were only the politics of the Church, an institution belonging to her external life, a divinely appointed convenience of ecclesiastical government. It is a doctrine and a devotion. It is an integral part of our Blessed Lord's own plan. He is in the Pope in a still higher way than He is in the poor or in children. What is done to the Pope, for him or against him, is done to Jesus Himself. All that is kingly, all that is priestly, in our dearest Lord is gathered up in the person of His Vicar, to receive our homage and our veneration. A man might as well try to be a good Christian without devotion to our Lady, as without devotion to the Pope; and for the same reason in both cases. Both His Mother and His Vicar are parts of our Lord's Gospel."

Once more. In no region of the earth have the touching words which we are going to cite been pondered with a more intense appreciation than in the United States of America, in none have they produced more enduring fruits. "The Pope is the visible presence of Jesus, uniting in himself all such spiritual and temporal jurisdiction as belongs to the Sacred Humanity. . . . In times when God allows the Church to be assailed in the person of her visible Head, sensitiveness about the Holy See will be found to be *an implied condition of all growth in grace*. . . . His office is the chief way in which Jesus has made Himself visible on earth. In his jurisdiction he is to us as if he were our Blessed Lord Himself." And then, "how touching is the helplessness of the Sovereign Pontiff, so like the helplessness of his beloved Master.

His power is patience. His majesty is endurance. He is the victim of all the petulance and gracelessness of earth in high places. He is verily the servant of the servants of God. Men may load him with indignities, as they spat into his Master's face. They may set him at nought with their men of war, as Herod with his men of war set at nought the Saviour of the world. . . . In every successive generation Jesus, in the person of His Vicar, is before fresh Pilates and new Herods. The Vatican is for the most part a Calvary." So that, as he adds, "to the eye of faith nothing can be more venerable than the way which the Pope represents God. It is as if heaven were always open over his head, and the light shone down upon him, and, like Stephen, he saw Jesus standing at the Right Hand of the Father, while the world is gnashing its teeth upon him with a hatred, the unearthly excess of which must often be a wonder to itself. But, to the unbelieving eye, the Papacy, like most divine things, is a pitiable and abject sight, provoking only an irritated scorn. For this scorn it is the object of our devotion to make constant reparation."* To which exhortation our American brethren respond, Amen !

Perhaps this will be the most suitable place to notice an incident, recorded by his biographer, which is not only immediately connected by its character with what has been just said, but which affords a proof of what we may perhaps presume to call the special favour and approval manifested by Pius IX. towards the author of this sermon. It was translated into Italian, and printed at Rome, by the express command of the Holy Father, who himself condescended to examine the proof-sheets. Among the concluding sentences of the sermon these words occur:—"It is a day when God looks for open professions of our faith. . . . The open profession is of little worth without the inward prayer, but I think the inward prayer is *almost* of less worth without the outward profession." It is surely a significant fact, worthy of religious meditation, that the word printed in italics was erased by the hand of Pius IX., who admonished by this action all the readers of Father Faber's sermon, not only that the doctrine which it taught was approved by the Vicar of Christ, but that the silent devotion of the heart was only a part of the service which he claims from his children, and that his Master requires from us all, especially in this hour of rebuke and blasphemy, the public and fearless manifestation of our loyalty to him who sits in Peter's chair.

We are glad to be able to illustrate by another anecdote the feelings entertained towards Father Faber by the great Pontiff, to whom Christians owe the definition of the Immaculate Conception of our Lady. Not long after his death one of the Fathers of the

* Sermon on Devotion to the Pope, pp. 12-16.

Brompton Oratory was kneeling at the feet of Pius IX., to whom he had been previously known. "Ah! you are one of Faber's sons," said the Holy Father, as soon as he had recognized the Oratorian, "and he is dead. He was a great loss not only to you, my child, but to the whole Church. And he is even now doing a great work by his writings."

All among us who feel most strongly their obligations to Father Faber, and cherish his name most lovingly in their hearts, may well accept the words just quoted as a sufficient acknowledgment of his claims to their respect and gratitude. If we now call attention to other utterances, less weighty though not less emphatic, it is not with the vain purpose of confirming testimony which is complete in itself, and incapable of addition from less august sources, but only to show the universality of a sentiment of which the Holy Father deigned on this occasion to be the interpreter.

We have alluded to the feeling entertained towards Father Faber by American Catholics, both among the clergy and laity, and especially to their recognition of his successful attempt to revise and enforce certain truths, and to propagate certain devotions, of which some had heretofore inadequately appreciated the value, but which these generous American Catholics had found by experience to be abundant fountains of light and grace. It would have been easy to multiply the evidences of this feeling, and it happens at the very moment of writing these lines that we find, in the last number of a valuable American periodical, an emphatic expression of it. "His writings," says this capable witness, after cordially adopting what he calls "the just eulogy" pronounced in a former number of this Review, "are too well known and too fondly esteemed, *especially in the United States*, for any criticisms to be called for here."* We learn also, at the same time, that the distinguished superior of the Paulist community of New York, than whom no one has a more exact knowledge of the feelings of American Catholics, being asked what effect Father Faber's writings had produced in his own country, replied:—"They have done more good in the United States than even in England." And now, if we turn from this youngest member of the great Christian family to the most ancient church of France, we shall find, in spite of the extreme dissimilarity of their past history, both religious and political, and of their national characteristics, that there is a complete coincidence in the sentiments expressed by French and American Catholics respectively towards Father Faber, and in their estimate of the value of his works.

We shall quote only two witnesses; but as one is a Jesuit and the other a Benedictine, they may be taken as adequate representa-

* *The Catholic World*, November, 1869, p. 159. New York.

tions of the judgments of our brothers in France. Father Bouix, of the Society of Jesus, the author of the well-known "Life of Saint Theresa," published in 1863 another work, bearing this title, "Saint Joseph d'après les Saints et les Maîtres de la Vie Spirituelle." In the 18th chapter of this book Father Bouix speaks as follows, in introducing a long extract from Father Faber's "Bethlehem":—"These passages are borrowed from Father Faber, of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri, in London. The author has in our own day taken his place among *the masters of the spiritual life*, and he is too well known to make it necessary that we should speak of him here. The extract from his book, entitled 'Bethlehem,' which we are about to put before our readers, is only a fragment of what is contained in that masterpiece on the subject of S. Joseph; so that whoever desires to learn how this writer treats the sublime distinctions and lofty titles of our glorious Patriarch must read the whole work. May S. Joseph, considering the immortal monument which Father Faber has just erected to his honour in the very city of London itself, hasten by his all-powerful intercession with God the hour in which England shall once more become the Isle of Saints." And these words, it should be observed, were written while Father Faber was still living.

The learned and pious Dom Guéranger, the Abbot of Solesmes, who has acquired by his intellectual labours so many claims to our esteem, employs language in speaking of Father Faber which is a still more exact reproduction of the eulogies pronounced by American witnesses. One passage from this writer, in which Father Faber's character as a theologian is exalted in such energetic terms, has been so generally quoted in English Catholic journals that we need not print it here; but Dom Guéranger is never weary of returning to the same theme, though familiar with all the noblest productions of his own country, and here are some of the words in which he appreciates the preaching and the life of him whose loss we mourn, though he still lives among us by his works:—

Father Faber was equal to every demand made upon him, and never failed to attract audiences, who were never weary of listening to him. Always ready, he was also always rich and abundant, and always overflowing with unction. In every word which fell from him his hearers recognized the vivacity of his faith and his ardent love of God. Superior to every human motive and to every weakness, never did he suffer his word, any more than his pen, to be restrained by a merely human consideration. Never would he have consented to veil either the peremptory absoluteness of dogma, or the rigours of evangelical morality, or the maxims of spiritual life. He knew that in the throng of his hearers, Protestants were standing among Catholics, and the worldly side by side with fervent Christians; but never did the desire to obtain the unanimous approval of this mixed auditory beguile him into any of those compromises, any of those suppressions of truth, by which

some are so easily tempted. He was too full of holy pride in possessing the truth which he had learned from the Church, the only source from which men can derive truth in this lower world, *to accommodate it to the taste of men who can never be anything but its humble disciples*; and if sometimes he irritated a certain class of minds, resembling in this respect the Son of God and His apostles, he invincibly attracted others, captivated by the spell of that intense conviction of which his powerful language was the expression. How many heretics did he reconcile to the Church! How many sinners did he convert! How many souls long plunged in feebleness and languor did he establish in the sure and solid path of Christian perfection! Moreover, we are assured by those who were habitual hearers of his discourses, that they were the counterpart of his writings, those writings of which it is not necessary to read many pages before one is kindled by their fire and overpowered by their holy ardour.

The life of Father Faber was a reflexion of the sentiments which reigned in his heart. This soul so full of the love of God, so deeply penetrated by the mysteries of the Incarnate Word, so completely under the dominion of the supernatural element, revealed itself incessantly in the utterances and the yearnings which escaped from it. . . . The same spirit which dwelt in S. Philip found in him a place of repose; in him we see once more the charity, the simplicity, the enthusiasm which lend such a charm to the life of that admirable saint whom the City of the Apostles celebrates by an annual festival as her second patron.

There is hardly a country in Europe from whose theologians we might not gather testimonies as decisive as those which come to us from France and America. But our space is limited, and we have still to speak of other services which it was Father Faber's happy privilege to render to the Church. We must not, however, omit to record here another remarkable tribute, which belongs toth is part of our subject, and which claims notice, not only on account of its intrinsic value, but because hitherto it has been known only to a single individual. About a year after the publication of Father Faber's "*Growth in Holiness*," a work which did not, it will be remembered, obtain universal approval, the late Dr. Pagani, a man of great prudence and piety, took occasion to criticise it in unfavourable terms. He had found that some consciences were disturbed by certain expressions in this volume, and having considerable influence as a spiritual writer and director of souls, he thought himself justified in attempting to remove what at that time he considered a possible cause of offence. With this object he placed himself in communication with a gentleman who had a large intercourse with English Catholics, and requested him to state, whenever the opportunity presented itself, that he, Dr. Pagani, admitted no authority in the work entitled "*Growth in Holiness*," and that no one need attach any importance to its statements. The gentleman in question, who knew that Father Faber never wrote a

page which he had not deeply pondered, nor expressed an opinion which he had not derived from a patient study of approved theologians, received this communication with respect, and was careful not to act upon it. Several years later this gentleman was waiting one morning at a railway station in the north of England, when he heard his name eagerly pronounced by a person who had just descended from a train going in another direction. The speaker was Dr. Pagani, who had only a few moments at his disposal, which he employed in uttering with great earnestness the following words: "I am thankful to have met you. Do you remember my speaking to you some years ago about Father Faber's 'Growth in Holiness,' and the request which I made to you with reference to that work? Well, I am anxious to retract what I said. I have since read all his works, and have lately finished 'The Creator and the Creature.' Ah! my dear sir, none but a doctor of the Church could have written it! What wisdom! what science! what singular elevation of mind! If you have led any one to suppose that I judged Father Faber unfavourably, pray remove the impression, and assure every one that no one venerates him more than I do." Fortunately this work of reparation was not needed, though Dr. Pagani resumed his seat in the train so rapidly that there was no time to tell him so.

It is not our purpose to attempt any critical estimate of Father Faber's works, nor is it necessary to do so. Others have judged them with an authority which we do not possess, and which determines their place in the catalogue of spiritual writings which have been added to the common treasury of the Church during the present generation. But we may be permitted, speaking only on behalf of the laity, and representing what we believe to be the general conviction of the mass of English Catholics, to allude to some of their characteristic features, and to indicate what we consider the chief benefits which private Christians have derived from them. It is well known that a certain prejudice was created in some minds by what, it cannot be denied, was a marked peculiarity of Father Faber's theological writings. People accustomed to the sober and unadorned diction of books which constituted the spiritual reading of an earlier generation, were, in some cases, both astonished and offended by a style of composition with which they were wholly unfamiliar. They had never before encountered a theologian who wrote like a poet. It was a novelty which irritated them, and which they found it difficult to pardon. What right had he to take them out of their own meagre vocabulary, which had always sufficed to express all their ideas, and speak to them in a language of which the copiousness was a puzzle, and of which the brilliancy only pained their eyes? The prophets of Israel, it is true, were poets, as he was; and so was David the king, and the inspired

seers who wrote the Book of Job and the Canticle of Canticles. Isaias was not inferior to Homer or Milton, even in his use of language; and some of the noblest passages in Shakespeare have no higher claim to our admiration than this, that they approach in sublimity certain chapters of the Old Testament. Even German critics have confessed that S. Paul, considered simply as an orator, might be fitly compared with Cicero. One of them did not fear to say, that in all the triumphs of human eloquence there is nothing to surpass the famous passage in the Epistle to the Romans which closes the eighth chapter. Some English people thought, however, that Father Faber had no right to be eloquent. It was, they deemed, a culpable innovation. Perhaps it is an answer to the objection, which we desire to treat seriously, that Father Faber could not help it. If he spoke like a poet, it was because that was his natural language. Like S. John Chrysostom, he was "golden-mouthed." Even his sermons are poems. If it was a fault, we are no more able to regret that he never corrected it than we are disposed to lament that Isaias wrote the chapter beginning, "*Who hath believed our report?*" or Ezechiel, that of which the first verse says: "*I stood by the river Chobar, and the heavens were opened, and I saw the visions of God.*" S. Paul did not write like S. John, though both were inspired; nor S. James like either of them. They had each his own style. Why should a man not use his gifts, especially when he makes such a use of them as Father Faber did? There is, perhaps, nothing in the English language more beautiful in colour and diction, though this was its least merit, than his marvellous description of the "Procession of the Precious Blood." Is its beauty a reproach? It seems so. Yet we venture to rejoice that a bard was not lost to England, as Wordsworth feared, when Father Faber devoted himself to religion, though he sang a nobler song than Wordsworth ever dreamed or imagined; nor can we see any reason to grieve, because, in becoming a theologian, he did not cease to be a poet.

If, indeed, the glitter of his sentences and the rich profusion of his imagery had been the chief or only merit of his writings, we should have regarded them with the temperate satisfaction which such works of art inspire, but we should not have searched them for instruction in holy things. This, however, is only an accidental quality in all which Father Faber wrote. His compositions were all, as is well known, the fruit of long meditation and laborious study. A more scrupulous and conscientious writer never lived, nor one who more jealously distrusted the rare facility with which he was endowed. Some who have ventured, in no unfriendly spirit, to question the accuracy of a particular theological statement, have been astonished by the flood of citations with which it was instantly justified. One who loved him with his whole heart, and sometimes

objected, by way of experiment, to a certain opinion or suggestion, was so overwhelmed by the crowd of authorities by whom he found himself presently confronted, that he inwardly resolved never again to tempt a similar discomfiture. We believe there was hardly a single theological statement in all the works published by Father Faber which he could not have traced in a few moments, at the demand of any disputant, hostile or friendly, to its original source in the writings of some approved doctor. If he *wrote* quickly, this was because he had never to search for *words*, and because he had saturated his mind with the whole subject upon which he was engaged before he took up his pen. Even when his work was finished, he had such a distaste for precipitancy, as well as such a deep sense of personal responsibility, that he often allowed a long interval, as we learn from his own assurance, to elapse between writing and printing ; so that the most fluent man of our time was also the most cautious, and he who possessed the greatest rapidity of expression was most on his guard against the use of it.

So much we desired to say about the style and method of Father Faber's compositions. If now we might venture to indicate the special quality of his works, which, in our judgment, constitutes their highest value as far as lay readers are concerned, we should say with confidence that they have done more to familiarize ordinary Christians with theological science and with the *intellectual* aspects of religious truth than all other spiritual writings in our language. No doubt, the simple and unlearned, who can only investigate truths of the supernatural order *mente cordis*, acquire from the most elementary catechism and the daily teaching of their pastors, sufficient knowledge to elicit acts of faith in all the doctrines necessary to salvation, and even attain in rare cases, by meditation and the silent teaching of the Holy Spirit, a kind of infused theological science. But this fact, which deserves our grateful admiration, does not tend in the faintest degree to diminish our appreciation of the intellectual methods by which a more exact knowledge of Christian doctrines and of their mutual relation is ordinarily acquired. Without insisting upon the infrequency of the exceptional cases referred to, it seems impossible to doubt that deep loss is sustained by a multitude of souls, to whom no such special and extraordinary graces are vouchsafed, by the inaction of the rational faculty in investigating the highest order of truths. If the indisposition to mental effort in the direction of theological inquiry were generally compensated, as it may be in individual cases, by meditation and prayer, there might be little to regret ; but where reason slumbers, conscience is apt to be equally inert. Perhaps it may be added that this danger is more real in the present age than at any former time. When the Church was the sole teacher of mankind, and the clergy the only depositories both of human and

divine learning ; when faith was universal, and even civil society was based upon the foundations established by the Incarnate Word ; the whole atmosphere was impregnated with the perfume of Christian truth, and wherever the eye turned it saw the evidences of its supremacy. Then, in the words of the poet, there were "sermons in stones," and men learned, so to speak, without effort, doctrines which nothing around them contradicted. Even, now, in some countries, as in the Austrian Tyrol, this condition of things has not wholly disappeared. Moreover, we should eagerly admit that, in less privileged regions, the gift of faith, combined with habitual attendance at the offices of the Church, is everywhere found to constitute a religious education of which we are not tempted to disparage the value. Many a peasant of Italy or Ireland, though unable to read or write, can explain mysteries which would have been too hard for Plato, and appreciate distinctions which would have perplexed Aristotle. Dr. Newman somewhere relates, if our memory does not deceive us, that he once interrogated an unkempt Irish boy, in company with other Anglican ministers, on certain articles of the Creed, and found him to be "the best theologian of the party." In noticing such facts, of which every day produces a fresh supply, while we joyfully admit that they prove faith to be an intellectual gift, and the Church the only effective teacher both of the learned and the unlearned, we find nothing in them to shake our conviction that careful dogmatic instruction carries with it an illuminating power which can be supplied, except by a miracle, from no other source, and is a mighty agent in developing Christian virtue. We have been assured by intelligent priests, that they have found a single sermon on dogma arrest the attention of the humblest hearer, and lead to more practical results than a whole series of moral discourses, a testimony which we received without any surprise. The editor of the French edition of the *Summa* of S. Thomas relates,—and he could have given no more eloquent justification of Father Faber's labours to make theology popular,—that he had known people long insensible to all ordinary appeals, and even women of the world who had been wholly given to a trivial and aimless life, led irresistibly to aim at perfection by being introduced for the first time to an intellectual and scientific exposition of the truths of faith. The Bishop of Orleans, in a well-known work, exhorts the laity, with all the weight of his great authority, to give themselves to the study of certain branches of theology, expressly as a means of enlisting the intellect on the side of truth, and confirming their souls in the love of God and His holy law. The advantage of such study is, then, sufficiently demonstrated, and we English owe to Father Faber a new encouragement to enter upon it, since he has placed at

our disposal a collection of treatises in which the most punctilious theological accuracy is united with all the charms of literary skill.

The works of Father Faber are, then, precious to us on this account, because they convey a mass of theological instruction which it deeply concerns us to possess, in a form admirably adapted to our time and circumstances. "I never knew anything of the theology of the Blessed Sacrament," we were once told by a highly intelligent woman, who had been for twenty years superior of a religious community, "until I read Father Faber's treatise on the subject, and it was from him that I learned to love, because I learned to comprehend, our Lord's sacramental life." Even if we admit that, in this case, there was something of the exaggeration with which exuberant gratitude acknowledges its debts, there are thousands in various countries, and especially in our own, who might repeat the same words with literal truth. But the works of Father Faber have another quality which claims our notice. Few theological writers, we presume to think, have been more successful in defining the true motives of supernatural virtue, none more effective in persuading to the devotional practices by which it is sustained and fortified. The exceeding hatefulness of sin becomes apparent in his writings, by unfolding the august laws which it violates, and by contrast with the loveliness of the virtues of which it is a lawless denial. It is dogma which rebukes the one and determines the other. Hence the connection between purity of doctrine and purity of life. Hence, also, the ease with which a Catholic who has fallen into sin can recover, if God does not refuse the opportunity, the graces which he had forfeited. His faith directs him to the prompt use of means which are simply omnipotent in their efficacy. And it is the knowledge of this fact which explains the tenderness which all the saints, after the example of our Lord and His Apostles, display towards sinners. It was so conspicuous in Father Faber, that Cardinal Wiseman compared him to S. Alphonsus. In his preface to one of the treatises of the Venerable Blossius, the Cardinal writes as follows:—

"Habemus igitur in Blossio ducem, quem sequamur, inoffenso pede. Quidquid in recentiori Alphonso, non laxi sed moderati consilii in sententiis inveneris, quidquid in Faure *de illimitata fere resipiscentium venia*, quidquid in Quadrupanio pro pusilli animi erectione (de qua tractatum scripsit ipse Blossius), quidquid denique in FABRO nostro *de ardenti Jesu amore, de tenerissima in SS. Sacramentum devotione, de que firma in Maria fiducia*, in venerabili Blossio anticipata hic videbis."

In attempting to estimate the immediate and prospective influence of Father Faber's writings, we shall certainly not err in giving a prominent place to his Collection of Hymns. If his other works have contributed, more than all modern productions, to

inform the consciences and stimulate the piety of English-speaking Catholics, his Hymns are a legacy to the most precious portion of the universal Church, the little ones of the flock of Christ. Who has heard them sung, whether in school or in church, by the children of our congregations, to tens of thousands of whom they have been, and will continue to be, both a source of dogmatic instruction and a fountain of tender devotion, without grateful admiration? Who can call to mind that they are sung by the banks of the Potomac and the Ohio, in the plains of Minnesota and the valleys of California, with the same fervour as in the towns and villages of our own land, and not confess that if he had bequeathed to his brethren no other gift, Father Faber would deserve to rank as one of our true benefactors? His hymns have been borrowed, we are told, even by men outside the Church, for whom our heart's desire is that, being called after us, they may one day, by using well the graces which we use imperfectly, be preferred before us. "In Catholic churches," says his biographer, "wherever the English language is spoken, the use of Father Faber's Hymns is almost universal. . . . Many are to be found in Protestant collections. Among others, 'Hymns Ancient and Modern,' contains several, and the 'Hymnal Noted,' no less than twenty-four."*

The peculiar character of Father Faber's hymns, as of all that he wrote, consists in this, that they are full of theological instruction, while they establish each Christian virtue which they aim at producing on the solid dogmatic basis which is at once its only real motive, and its only secure defence. If we compare them with the vapid and sentimental versification of Protestant authors, in which the doctrine, when it is not openly heretical, is as vague and undefined as an autumn mist, and in which people are feebly invited to practise virtues which are not intelligible for reasons which are not explained, we shall contemplate with fresh indignation that fatal divorce between doctrine and morals which the world owes to Protestantism, and against which every page of Father Faber's writings is an eloquent protest. Nothing more pure, nothing less unworthy of our holy religion, has ever been produced outside the Church than the "Christian Year" of the amiable and gifted Keble; yet even he could handle one of the most practical of Christian doctrines, the mystery which is most intimately connected with the growth of spiritual life, with such deplorable ambiguity of phrase, that his admirers are still debating whether he believed the Anglican sacrament to be received "in the hand" or "in the heart," still uncertain whether he quitted the world with any clear conviction himself about the doctrine which he taught so confusedly to others. Such is the confusion and disorder which cloud

* Life, p. 492.

even the noblest minds in the dark region which lies beyond the frontiers of the Catholic Church. An Anglican clergyman, from whom we received the tale, once asked the Vicar of Hursley if he could show him any point of contact between the established sect and the Church of the Saints. "Show me," he said, "any connection, however slight, between this severed branch and the trunk to which you say it is still attached, and I will abide where I am; but if you cannot do this, I dare not peril my salvation, and I must submit to the Catholic Church." "I do not know," said Mr. Keble, after a long pause, "that I can show any connection *above* ground, but may there not be *underground suckers*?" Our friend, who was not attracted by this prospect of subterranean fellowship with the saints, and who reflected that in the darkness of the lower sphere to which he was invited to descend it would be impossible to tell whose hand he was grasping, sought elsewhere the entrance-gate which Mr. Keble failed to discover, and found it.

It is sad to be led to gloomy reflections by the words of such a man as Keble, but the more highly we esteem his gifts, the more momentous is the lesson which his example affords. The guesses and peradventures of Anglican theology, which doubts most when it seems most to affirm, and is never so rashly zealous in adopting any opinion whatever as to exclude its contradictory, are to the immutable faith of Catholics what the shifting sand which every tide displaces is to the rock at whose base it lies. Yet there are men who seem to like the risks and perils of building on sand, as the dwellers on the Pacific coast constantly reconstruct on the same site the shattered tenements which an earthquake has just demolished. Father Faber built on other foundations, and his Hymns, like all which he produced, are monuments of a faith as fixed and stable as the truths which are its object.

Besides the original works with which we have been enriched by Father Faber's fertile pen, it is to his initiative that we owe the series known as the Oratorian Lives of the Saints. It was a thought worthy of Father Faber, if we may presume to say so, to illustrate the special truths which he was always enforcing, by displaying to us *in action* the same doctrines and principles which it was his special mission to recommend to our veneration. The attempt, as is well known, did not succeed without encountering a momentary check. The language of some of the saints, to say nothing of their actions, was as new to a certain class of readers as that of Father Faber himself had been. It might suit Spaniards or Italians, who are dreamy and impulsive, but was an offence to the cooler temper of a more northern race. It is surely a melancholy proof of the need of that genuine reformation which Cardinal Wiseman hoped to witness, and which Father Faber lived to accomplish, that the principal opponent of the Saints'

Lives could say of "recorded actions of saints," that some of them "are worthy neither of admiration nor imitation, and had far better be confined to respectful oblivion." It is also a consoling proof of the growth of that purer and higher sentiment which Father Faber did so much to foster, that this objector ultimately retracted his protest, and deplored, with generous compunction, what he called "the unhappy state of feeling" which had led him to utter words by which he had "deeply offended Almighty God."* The whole outcry which rose at this time against the series in question, and the repugnance manifested towards "Italian compositions" and "foreign devotions," seemed to imply a latent suspicion that as the English occupy a particular place in the scheme of redemption, they are bound to have a religion of their own. But Catholic instincts triumphed, as might have been anticipated, over insular prejudice and presumption. The whole story is so well told by an American writer, that we gladly relate it in his words. They will serve to show, once more, that none have adopted more cordially Father Faber's principles, nor more zealously defend his name, than our American brethren:—

It was not only from Protestants that Father Faber had to suffer annoyance; his worst troubles came from those of his own faith. About the time of his ordination he had made arrangements for the publication of a series of lives of the saints, translated from the Italian and other foreign languages, and afterwards so widely known as the Oratorian Lives. . . . The series began with a "Life of S. Philip Neri." It reached a large sale; but so little familiar were English readers with the supernatural manifestations which abound in biographies of the chosen servants of God, that exception was taken to the work in various quarters, and when the "Life of S. Rose of Lima" appeared, the opposition became extremely violent. It was objected that the lives of foreign saints, however edifying in their respective countries, were unsuited to England and unfit for Protestant eyes. Under the advice of Dr. Newman, who nevertheless approved the work very cordially, the series was finally suspended. But then a reaction set in; it was discovered *how much practical good the publications had done*; some of those who had criticised them most severely retracted and apologised; and the translations were resumed under the auspices of the Oratorians.†

How many souls have been initiated by the study of these lives into the science of the saints, how many will hereafter derive true wisdom from them, no man can tell; but whether the fruit of this wide-spreading tree be more or less abundant, the hand which planted it was Father Faber's, and the praise is also his. The transient opposition to this particular work is compensated by the final result to which it conduced.

* Life of Father Faber, p. 355.

† The Catholic World, p. 156, November 1869.

If we pass now from the consideration of particular works, of which Father Faber was either the sole author or the active originator, and of which we can estimate approximately the probable effect in the Church, to the wider subject of his *general influence* on the thoughts and habits of English Catholics, and especially on the tone of their theology, we can only express personal opinions, liable to correction, and of which we accept the entire responsibility. It should be observed, however, before we enter upon this subject, that the general influence of which we are about to speak cannot justly be limited to English and American Catholics, though Father Faber's writings were primarily addressed to those who spoke the language in which they were written. Of those writings, most of them contained in volumes of considerable dimensions and cost, more than one hundred thousand copies have already been sold in England and America. But their sale in other countries, where many of them have been eagerly translated, is too remarkable a fact, especially on account of the unusual proportions which that sale has attained, not to deserve special notice. In France, where the native theological and devotional literature is so rich and abundant that they might well seem able to dispense with foreign contributions, the sale of the translated works of Father Faber, including those circulated in Belgium, but not the six thousand copies published in Flemish, has reached the prodigious total of *eighty-three thousand and five hundred copies*. Even Bossuet might have been content with a success so astonishing. Germany has taken for her share *fifty-two thousand two hundred and fifty copies* of the same works. *Ten thousand* have been sold in Italy and Spain; while in Russia, not including Catholic Poland, we learn with surprise that the circulation has reached *forty-four thousand*. Up to this time, therefore, the total number of copies of Father Faber's works actually sold exceeds *three hundred thousand*, and the sale continues daily.

But this purely arithmetical statement, though it substantiates a fact which twenty years ago would have seemed to English Catholics beyond the range of the probable, and even of the possible, can only be duly appreciated by considering, on the one hand, all that it includes or implies; and on the other, certain phenomena which exist side by side, and, as we confidently believe, in most intimate connection with it. It is to these that we now wish to call attention.

We have said, in the beginning of this article, that our own generation inherited from an earlier one evils which demanded instant remedy. Cardinal Wiseman and Father Faber were deeply conscious of this fact. The biographer of the latter, though constrained to speak with extreme reserve, shows clearly what was his real position towards the English Catholic body. He was not

"a spokesman for English Catholics," he truly observes. "A spokesman is one who expresses the sentiments of a large body, being deputed to do so because he understands and agrees with their opinions. Such a position Father Faber never occupied: he was a leader, not a spokesman; the mission he accomplished was to educate, not to represent, the Catholics of England."* And Father Faber, as his whole life proved, knew his mission, or he would never have accomplished it so effectually. "When he entered the Church," continues his biographer, some of whose words we print in italics, "his first care was to *put himself in harmony with her spirit*, not as he found it in a country where the remembrance of recent persecution, and of the necessity of concealment, still hampered the freedom of its operation; but as it flourishes in lands where all traditions are its own. Especially did he endeavour to study it at its fountain-head in the city of Rome, under the shadow of S. Peter's chair. Fully recognizing the claims of his own country to his labours, he *made it his business* to introduce into it in every possible way *the devotions and practices which are consecrated by the usage of Rome*."

It was impossible to express more clearly in a few words what it was Father Faber's aim to do, and next we are told how he did it. "Himself considerably in advance of his fellow-countrymen in this particular, he translated and printed the various expressions of foreign Catholic devotion, *teaching and persuading all who came under his influence*, first to adopt, and then to disseminate them." In one of his sermons, quoted by his biographer, he said:—"Truth is not ours to bate and pare down; truth is God's. . . . Beware of trying to throw aside or to pare down what seems most faithful and warm in the devotions of foreign lands; do not tell that cruel falsehood, do not tell it to those whom you love, and are longing and yearning to have within the Church, do not tell them that the faith is other here than what it is elsewhere; do not throw aside devotion and sweetness, and worship and affection, as though they were not fit for us, as though God's Church were not one; for this is nothing less in reality than to deny the unity of God's Church." We will take the liberty of adding, that if Protestants sometimes affect to be scandalized by the tone of foreign devotions, they are in truth much more scandalized, and with better reason, by the meanness and inconsistency of those Catholics who hope to prove their superior intelligence by insinuating disapproval of them.

But Father Faber did not limit himself to personal action, whether by writing or exhortation. "A new impulse was given to Catholic devotion by the hymns and popular services of the London Oratory, the one directed and the other written by Father

* Life, p. 469.

Faber. Here the prayers and aspirations of the Saints are brought into familiar use, to form the basis of the spiritual life of many pious souls. The plain, unadorned style wherein S. Philip directs his children to set forth the mysteries of the Faith serves the same end. Another most powerful instrument is the Confraternity of the Precious Blood, now so well known in this country.* By these and other means, upon which we need not dwell, Father Faber "accomplished his mission," described by Cardinal Wiseman as that of "promoting and extending in the Church the spirit of holiness and of true piety." In the letter which the Cardinal addressed to him just before his death, we find this emphatic recognition of the work which he had been privileged to do. "Your exertions have been eminently blest, not only in England, but in every country, as the Holy Father himself declared to me. . . . I will not dwell on the great work which you have founded, and which will remain, not long, but for ever, to perpetuate the good you have done while living. It is not the mere edifice, however great, of the Oratory, which will do this, but the spirit of S. Philip which you have brought into London, and which will ever continue alive and active in his children."†

It may seem superfluous to add anything to the words just quoted, yet we desire to show, by a final quotation, that the peculiar mission of Father Faber is comprehended in exactly the same sense by the Catholics of the United States as by the highest ecclesiastical authority in England. "Bishop Wiseman," observes the writer in the *Catholic World*, "was a warm supporter of the Oratorians, but many of the secular clergy looked upon them with suspicion, . . . and complained that their peculiar services, with new prayers, hymns in the vernacular, and a new style of preaching, were Methodistical, and ought to be suppressed. Experience, however, in time showed the doubters their mistake, and the diocesan clergy became not only friends but imitators of the Oratorians."

We cannot presume to say how far our clergy would accept this American account as accurate, a point on which they alone are entitled to speak; but we may perhaps assume their general acquiescence, since it is certain that the "services" at the Oratory have long ceased to be "peculiar," and that there is now no longer a Catholic church in England on whose doors it would be possible to write "no popery" with any approach to descriptive propriety. The old state of things, against which the four solemn resolutions of Cardinal Wiseman, and the life-long toils of Father Faber, have proved to be so fruitful a protest, has passed away, never to return. Italian devotions shock nobody now, for we meet them everywhere. Even images of our Lady and S. Joseph, once almost unknown

* Life, p. 472.

† Ibid., p. 509.

‡ Ibid., p. 157.

amongst us, are now carried in solemn procession, with the hearty approval of devout congregations. Communion is everywhere more frequent, devotion to the Church and to her apostolic chief more ardent and tender, indifference to the world and its judgments more thorough and universal. We are all Roman now, in England, America, and everywhere else, with exceptions so few and of so little account, that murmurs against what is called Ultramontane doctrine now only excite compassion, and awake no echo. Gallicanism is as dead as Jansenism, and only a feeble and disconsolate group, who appear to be themselves in the last stage of exhaustion, follow the defunct twins to their grave. Everywhere the auspicious revival, of which Cardinal Wiseman and Father Faber were the principal agents, is complete. It has been a revival both of true doctrine and true holiness. And it is much to be noted that this revival has been accompanied, as if to attest whose work it was, by a stream of conversions so unprecedented in their number and character, that it is impossible not to regard them as one of its natural results. Fifty years ago conversions were not, indeed, wholly unknown, for there was never a time, however dark, in which predestined souls were not "added daily to the Church,"* but in England they were hardly more frequent than eclipses of the moon, and excited almost as much observation. *Now* the only question is, how long the classes who have become impregnated with Catholic doctrine will resist the call to enter the Church which a special grace is addressing to them, and which so many have already obeyed. In the single year 1868, and in three only of the London churches, two thousand Protestants, belonging for the most part to the ranks of the educated, abjured their errors, and made profession of the Catholic faith. And even this evidence of the mighty change which a few years have wrought in a nation once wholly abandoned to religious error, is not the most impressive, nor perhaps, except to the converts themselves, the most consoling. The Archbishop of Westminster remarked recently, in a sermon preached at the Church of Notre Dame de France, that devotion to the Immaculate Queen of Heaven and fertility in apostolic missions to the heathen always go together, and have long been the special glory of the French Church. And already, in our own land, increased confidence in the same Virgin Mother and S. Joseph, and a more universal recourse to their protection, due in so large a measure to Father Faber's teaching, have produced a similar overflow of spiritual life. They are, we feel assured, the secret springs of that new enterprise, the Foreign Missionary College of S. Joseph's, Mill Hill, of which the perpetuity is now guaranteed, though it

* Acts ii. 47.

was one of those nobly rash undertakings which succeed because, humanly speaking, success is impossible.

We have attempted to enumerate, with an incompleteness of which we are fully conscious, but for which a loving intention may partly compensate, some of the characteristics of Father Faber's work in the Church—some of his most obvious titles to our affectionate reverence and gratitude. It remains only to speak briefly of that which will probably prove to be, in future years, the most fruitful and permanent of all the benefits which he has bequeathed to us.

We have said that Father Faber was one of those whose work lives after them. We have seen this admitted by the Holy Father, and recognized in emphatic terms by Cardinal Wiseman. "You have brought the spirit of S. Philip into London," said the latter to the dying Oratorian, "which will ever continue alive and active in his children." "Of the twenty-seven members of the community subject to him," says one who on this point could speak with more authority than the Cardinal himself, "there were only four who had not been brought to S. Philip *by his guidance*, and none who did not feel the more, as years went on, that their religious perseverance and progress were dependent upon him more than upon any other human influence."* It is, then, by the grateful confession of its own members, to Father Faber that we owe what the Cardinal called in a solemn hour "the great edifice of the Oratory." If we shrink from expressing in our own language our sense of what English Catholics owe, and will continue to owe, to the Fathers of the Oratory, it is only because we have no claim to be the interpreters of a sentiment which we believe to be universal, and because we prefer to acknowledge in the silence of our own hearts an obligation which may be better acquitted by following their counsels than by praising their acts. This only we will say:—If zeal without intemperance, and enthusiasm tempered by discretion; if watchfulness combined with patience, and fidelity as teachers united with obedience as subjects; if testimony to the highest spiritual truth illustrated by the purest Christian example; if these are titles to our love and esteem, we find them in those who have inherited Father Faber's mission, as well as "the spirit of S. Philip," in which he accomplished it. "Happy are we," says an American Father of the Society of Jesus, with whose words we may appropriately conclude, "in the knowledge that there are many, on this side of 'the great waters,' who cannot think of the Fathers of the English Oratory without sentiments of profound gratitude, admiration, and respect. Their labours, their sacrifices, their virtues, their victories for God and His Church,—in a word, all that they have done, have done so well,

* Life, p. 504.

in so short a time, and are still doing, for the temporal and eternal welfare of God's world,—rise up like a 'blessed vision of peace' between us whenever some Government pique ruffles the temper of our kindred nations. At such moments the earnest but almost unanswered wish of England's great Cardinal—for how can we speak of the English Oratory and not be full of the memory of Cardinal Wiseman?—again presses us to entreat that prayer, daily prayer, may be offered up, especially in our religious houses, for the conversion of England and its people."*

ART. VI.—MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS.—THE CASKET PAPERS.

1. *Mary Queen of Scots and Her Accusers. Embracing a Narrative of Events from the Death of James V., in 1542, until the Death of the Regent Murray, in 1570.* By JOHN HOSACK, Barrister-at-Law. 8vo. Blackwood & Sons. Edinburgh and London. 1869.
2. *Mary Stuart: Her Guilt or Innocence. An Inquiry into the Secret History of Her Times.* By ALEXANDER McNEEL-CAIRD. Second edition. With Reply to Mr. Froude. 8vo. Edinburgh. Adam & Charles Black. 1866.
3. *History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. *Reign of Elizabeth* (vols. vii.—x.). 8vo. London. Longman & Co. 1864-6.
4. *The History of Scotland from Agricola's Invasion to the Revolution of 1688.* By JOHN HILL BURTON. 8vo. (Vol. iv.) Blackwood & Sons. 1867.
5. *Marie Stuart et le Comte de Bothwell.* Par L. WIESENER. 8vo. Paris. 1863.
6. *Marie Stuart et ses derniers Historiens.* Par L. WIESENER. (*Revue des Questions Historiques. Deuxième Année. Livraisons 8—10.*) 8vo. Paris. Victor Palmé. 1868.

MR. HOSACK'S volume affords an opportunity for which we have been anxiously waiting. We have more than once† expressed our belief that the whole case of Mary Queen of Scots, not alone as regards the Darnley murder, but as to

* American edition of "The Creator and the Creature," Introduction, p. xii.

† DUBLIN REVIEW, vol. xxxii. p. 145, and New Series, vol. iii. p. 109.

almost every other detail of the charges against her, may be said to turn upon a single point—the genuineness of her alleged letters to Bothwell, commonly known as the “Casket Letters.” If these letters be indeed genuine, there is no conceivable crime too atrocious not to be credible of her as the writer. If, on the contrary, these letters be forged, she must be regarded as the victim of a conspiracy so foul and so recklessly wicked that we may justly look with distrust, if not with positive disbelief, upon every allegation of her enemies, even in matters not connected with the direct subject of the conspiracy.

In Mr. Hosack’s careful and learned review of the controversy as to the guilt or innocence of Queen Mary, these famous letters occupy a prominent place; but the discussion regarding them suffers in point of clear and consecutive arrangement by being mixed up with the stirring incidents of the general narrative; and although there is no portion of Mr. Hosack’s elaborate essay which is not deserving of the closest study, we have resolved to separate the critical from the historical discussion, and to confine ourselves in the present paper to this single branch of the inquiry. We have already, in reviewing M. Mignet’s “Life of Mary Stuart,” and in our notice of the seventh and eighth volumes of Mr. Froude’s “History of England,” entered at some length into the extrinsic evidences of the authenticity of the contents of the casket. But Mr. Hosack, as well by reproducing the text of the letters, as by carefully bringing together all the scattered fragments of contemporary narrative which can serve to illustrate or to test the incidents and allusions which are disclosed in the correspondence, has supplied many new materials for the illustration of the intrinsic evidence bearing on the question of its authenticity; and he thus enables us to reconsider the subject with the special advantage of having under view at one and the same time both the intrinsic and the extrinsic arguments which may be advanced upon either side.

The Casket Papers, it is true, are confined within comparatively narrow limits, and the really important letters profess to have been written within a very small number of days at two different periods. But in their allusions and in the associations which they suggest, they cover the whole period of the Darnley conspiracy and the Bothwell marriage; and it is through circumstances and incidents derived exclusively from them and entirely unsupported by other authority, that the most damning evidence of the guilt of the unhappy princess is derived. In the manner of dealing with these documents,

there is a very marked difference between the courses taken by the two latest historians of the period, Mr. Froude in his *History of England*, and Mr. Burton in the fourth volume of his *History of Scotland*.

Mr. Froude has made them the text of his narrative of the married life of the Queen with Darnley, and has drawn mainly from them the history of Darnley's murder, with all the antecedent and subsequent history. With characteristic impetuosity he assumes their authenticity from the outset. He accepts the incidents and statements which they supply, as matters which it is impossible to doubt "without turning history into a mere creation of imaginative sympathies."* He accompanies this assumption, it is true, with a promise that the authenticity, assumed for the moment, should be discussed in a later volume, in connection with the history of the discovery of the papers and with the examination which then took place. How far he has fulfilled that pledge, we shall have occasion to see.

On the contrary, Mr. Burton, throughout his narrative of Mary's reign,† rigorously abstains, up to the very day on which the correspondence between the queen and Bothwell is said to have been discovered on the arrest of Bothwell's servant Dalglish, from all use of the Casket Letters, and from all allusion to their contents; and in a most especial manner he professes to refrain from employing the Casket Letters, or any circumstance, allusion, or motive, which is only known through them, for the purpose of incriminating Mary, or of giving to facts otherwise known, but in themselves indifferent, a colouring unfavourable to her.

We confess that both these modes of procedure appear to us indefensible on any sound judicial or historical principle. Either the "Casket Letters" are genuine, or they are not. If they be genuine, they are, from the very first point of the narrative with which they connect themselves, necessary materials of the history of Mary Stuart and Bothwell—essential elements of any rational judgment as to the guilt or innocence of either or of both. If they be not genuine, it is equally plain, not only that the incidents or suspicions which they supply must be at once discarded from the inquiry, but that the very fact of their forgery becomes, even at the first point of the tragical story to which it belongs, a vitally significant circumstance;—first as influencing the judgment which is to be formed regarding the particular facts which depended

* *History of England*, viii. p. 352.

† *History of Scotland*, iv. p. 428.

solely on the authority of the documents ; and secondly, as suggesting the strongest suspicion of the general credibility of the allegations which this fraudulent fabrication of evidence was intended to sustain. If it be too much to rest, as we have already suggested, the entire case of Mary Stuart on this single suggestion, no one can doubt that the truly philosophical course must be, first of all to investigate the genuineness of these as well as of the other matters laid in evidence in the cause, and then, according to the result to frame the narrative, in its integrity and in its natural sequence, from the very earliest incident related or alluded to in the supposed correspondence between the actors in the story.

Still, of the courses pursued by the two historians respectively, no one can doubt that, if Mr. Burton's caution has led to the possible withdrawal of important elements of the historical verdict, Mr. Froude's summary procedure is, in relation to the issue of the controversy, by far the more mischievous in itself and the less defensible on philosophical grounds. His *History of England*, as the reader is aware, has been published in divisions, the successive instalments of which have been separated by considerable intervals. The story of Mary Stuart, in consequence, is presented to his readers, not as a whole, nor even in complete periods distinct and well separated from each other, but in disjointed fragments, each necessarily having a bearing upon the antecedents or the consequents of the general history, or upon both. It is quite impossible to consider the murder of Darnley except in connection with Mary's subsequent marriage ; and the Casket Letters are darkly but inseparably associated with both. As a consequence of this fragmentary publication of Mr. Froude's work, the story of Mary has been told in three successive divisions ; the first, in the seventh and eighth volumes, issued in 1863 ; the second, in the ninth and tenth, which were published in 1866 ; and the third, in the eleventh and twelfth, which have just appeared while we are engaged on the present paper. The first of these divisions of the story broke off, in 1863, with the murder of Darnley, nor were the subsequent events resumed till 1866. Now the Casket Letters belong to both periods alike, and indeed their criminatory revelations fall far more heavily upon Mary in the former. And yet, throughout the whole narrative as published in 1863, Mr. Froude not only assumed their genuineness, but, as we pointed out in a former notice, interwove into his picturesque story every criminatory fact which the letters supply ; presented every incident and every circumstance in the light of the motives of action which the letters disclose,

and converted into damning evidence of guilt, through the confession of pre-concert with Bothwell, the most indifferent and even natural incidents of Mary's relations with Darnley during the period which immediately preceded his murder. In this way Mr. Froude extorted from the reader, upon evidence which was still unproven, and the opportunity of examining which was indefinitely postponed, a verdict against the queen, which, as her case was presented in his pages, hardly even her most devoted advocates could withhold. Having done this, it might at least be expected that his examination of the genuineness of the letters, when it should take place, would have been minute, searching, and dispassionate, in proportion to the importance of the issue which it involves, and which he himself had already assumed in anticipation of this very examination. But we regret to say that it is the very reverse. Notwithstanding the promise of full discussion with which the letters were assumed from the outset, when the subject, after an interval of three years, returns for consideration, he dismisses it in a few contemptuous sentences; puts aside as weak and sentimental the notion of seriously entertaining a doubt as to the authenticity of the letters; and contents himself with accepting them as indisputably the genuine compositions of Mary Stuart, in a passionate and declamatory paragraph, superficial, reckless, and one-sided in the last degree.

Under these circumstances we think it desirable to return to the subject. We shall follow, as our chief authority, the admirable summary contained in Mr. Hosack's pages; availing ourselves, as we proceed, of materials derived from various other quarters, and especially from Mr. M'Neel-Caird's spirited and striking Lectures and from the able and exhaustive papers of M. Wiesener, in "*Revue des Questions Historiques*" for 1868.

Independently of the historical importance of these celebrated letters, their history in a merely literary point of view is extremely curious, and indeed is involved in no little mystery. Doubts have arisen, and, to some extent, still subsist, as to their number, as to their dates and order of succession, as to the language in which they were written, and as to the ultimate fate of the alleged originals; but, putting aside the literary interest which attaches to each of these discussions, it will easily be understood that every one of them must have an important bearing on the value of the documents considered as materials of history.

The story of their discovery is as follows:—

When, on the 7th of June, 1567, Bothwell and the Queen hurriedly withdrew from Edinburgh to the strong castle of

Borthwick, the former neglected to carry with him a casket of valuable papers which was deposited in the Castle of Edinburgh, in the custody of the governor, Sir James Balfour. The casket is described as about a foot in length, of silver, gilt and enamelled, and bearing the crown of France, and the letter F, the initial of Francis II., Mary's first husband, from whom it passed to her, and subsequently to Bothwell. After Bothwell's separation from Mary at Carberry Hill, and his flight to Dunbar, he sent his servant, George Dalgleish, to Balfour, on the 20th of June, with orders to carry the casket to him at Dunbar; and Balfour, who after Bothwell's fall had made his peace with the confederate lords, is believed, while apparently complying with Bothwell's order, to have given such notice to the confederates as to enable the Earl of Morton to intercept the messenger and possess himself of the casket. On the return of the Earl of Murray to Scotland, Morton placed the casket in his hands, and Murray made use of the alleged contents on several occasions (although with great caution and secrecy, and always in circumstances of such reserve as to have suggested grave suspicion) for the purpose of justifying the rebellion of the confederates against Mary and of compelling her submission.

The occasions on which he is said to have produced the Casket Papers are four in number:—In the Privy Council of Scotland, on the 4th of December, 1567; in the Scottish Parliament, on the 15th of the same month; at the conference at York, on the 17th of October, 1568; and finally at Westminster, on the 8th and 9th of December in the same year.

The alleged contents of the casket, such as they have come down to us, are all of a nature highly criminatory of Mary. They consist of two signed contracts of marriage with Bothwell, one without date, the other dated at Seton, April 5th, 1567; eight letters without signature, address, or (with one exception) date, but bearing internal evidence of being addressed by Mary to Bothwell; and twelve love sonnets (or, more properly, a long poetical address divided into sonnet stanzas of fourteen lines, eleven in number, with a twelfth stanza of six lines) also supposed to be addressed to Bothwell. But besides these papers, of which copies, although of dubious origin, are preserved, others were exhibited in the proceeding against the Queen at York and Westminster, of which no subsequent notice or trace has been discovered; especially a letter of Mary, containing an account of a quarrel between Darnley and her brother Lord Robert, which she was charged with having provoked in the hope of Darnley's being slain; another,

a warrant under her hand, which was exhibited to the Scottish lords at the well known "Ainslie's supper" in order to induce them to sign the bond for her marriage with Bothwell. Both papers were of a highly criminatory purport; but, having produced their intended effect at York and Westminster, they disappear from the cause altogether.

The history of these papers, after their production in the York and Westminster conferences, is equally calculated to create embarrassment and uncertainty. Murray, notwithstanding the earnest protest of Mary and her commissioners, jealously retained possession of the originals and carried them back to Scotland. From him they passed into the hands of Morton, who retained them during his regency. On his execution they fell into the hands of the Earl of Gowrie; but from the date of Gowrie's execution nothing further is certainly known regarding them. It has been conjectured, with small probability, that, having fallen into the hands of James VI., they were by him destroyed, as the supposed evidence of his mother's guilt; but of this no evidence whatever has been discovered. Mr. Burton, indeed, quotes in a note* a letter of the late eminent antiquarian, Mr. Joseph Robertson, containing what Mr. Burton seems to accept as probable evidence of the correctness of this conjecture; but we think it plain that the authority which he quotes cannot apply to documents preserved in Scotland. Whatever may be said as to the probability of James having destroyed the records of his mother's trial at the commission, the papers so destroyed could only have been those of the English State Paper Office. Now nothing is more certain in the whole history of this strange and mysterious transaction, than that the Casket Letters, not only were not deposited among the English records, but that, while copies or translations of them were furnished to the English commissioners, the originals themselves were never entrusted to them, but were retained by Murray in his own hands, and carried back by him to Scotland as soon as he was released by Elizabeth from attendance at the commission.

The Casket Letters were not made public at the time of the Commissions in 1568. They became known to the world, not in the originals, but in a translation which was appended to Buchanan's "Detection of the Doings of Queen Mary," published in November, 1571. From what language Buchanan's version was made, is a point which has been very warmly

* IV., 424.

debated. As it is of considerable importance in its bearing upon the general question of their authenticity, we cannot avoid adverting to it before proceeding farther. The author of a French version of Buchanan's "Detection," which appeared in 1572, nominally at Rochelle, but in reality, it is supposed, under the auspices of Cecil, in London, states that the letters were written *partie en François, partie en Ecossois*, and were all translated from these languages into Latin; and he adds that, as he was ignorant of Scotch, his version has been made, not from the Scotch, but from the Latin translation. This is certainly incorrect; since only three of the letters were originally translated into Latin, and one of them, except the first sentence, only existed in Scotch, until the French version was published by Mr. Hosack. But whatever may be said on this head, that the original language of five of the letters was Scotch all critics seem now to be agreed; and of two at least, and these the most important, this was expressly alleged by Murray when he exhibited them privately to the English commissioners at York. The two letters in question profess to have been written from Glasgow.

We have the first detailed account of their contents at York in October 1568, when they were privately shown to the commissioners appointed by Elizabeth to inquire into the charges made against Mary by her rebellious subjects. The two foregoing letters were produced, with other letters and documents, by the Earl of Murray and his associates, to prove the guilt of their sovereign, and they were produced in the Scotch language. Of this we have the best possible evidence. The original despatch addressed by the English commissioners to Elizabeth is still preserved in the Cotton Library; it contains a number of extracts from the two preceding letters, and these extracts are all in Scotch. That, in making these extracts, the English commissioners forwarded them as the identical expressions of the Scottish queen, appears to be certain. The letters were produced neither as copies nor translations, but as the original letters of the Queen of Scots. And upon this point the words of the commissioners are clear and positive. "And these men here," they say, referring to Murray and his associates, "do constantly affirm the said letters and other writings which they produce of her own hand to be her own hand indeed, and do offer to swear and take their oaths thereupon." No words can be more explicit.

The same is equally clear, both from intrinsic evidence and from authority, of three other letters—those said to have been addressed to Bothwell by Mary from Stirling on the eve of her capture and abduction by him. Mr. Hosack dwells on this point of resemblance between the Stirling and the Glasgow letters, that, of the versions which we possess of both sets of letters, the Scotch is in both cases unquestionably the original;

and, as this is a point on which the representatives of both sides of the controversy, Whitaker and Laing, are agreed, it seems unreasonable to call it in question. Now, strange as it may appear, while Murray, in exhibiting the Glasgow letters at York, produced a copy in Scotch, and averred it to be the original in the Queen's own hand, Mr. Hosack has discovered in the Record Office and prints in his Appendix* the original Journal of the Commission, held a few weeks later, at Westminster, according to which the same Murray and his colleagues produce the self-same Glasgow letters, *not in Scotch, but "in French, and in Romain hand, which they avowed to be a letter of the Queen's own hand :"*—

"After this," continues the journal, "the said earl and his colleagues offered to show certain proofs, not only of the Queen's hate towards the king her husband, but also of inordinate love towards Bothwell ; for which purpose they first produced a letter written in French, and in Roman hand, which they avowed to be a letter of the Queen's own hand sent to Bothwell when she was at Glasgow." They then produced the short Glasgow letter (No. 1) already laid before the reader.

They next produced "one other long letter" (No. 2), "written also with the like hand in French," which they also declared to be in the Queen's own handwriting. They further stated that this letter contained certain details—namely, those relating to Hiegate and the Laird of Minto—which, of their own knowledge, they knew to be true. With the production of this letter the proceedings of the day closed ; but it is to be observed, that although the journal states that these two letters were "produced," it does not state that they were left for examination in the hands of Elizabeth's commissioners. From the proceedings of the following day we may conclude that they were not.

We shall have occasion to refer to this point once again before we close ; and we only allude to it now as one of the curiosities of this curious literary history. Even if it were admitted that a French rendering of the Glasgow letters presented by Murray at York and Westminster would have been the true original of which the extant Scotch letter is a translation, it is clearly demonstrable, from a hundred plain heads of comparison which Goodall and Whitaker have detailed, that the extant French version cannot be that presented by Murray. No one comparing the extant Scotch letters with the extant French and Latin, can for a moment fail to see, not only that the Scotch is the original and that the French must have been translated therefrom, but also that the French version was not made directly from the Scotch, but through the medium of the Latin which was itself translated from the Scotch. For our present

* P. 552.

purpose, it will be sufficient to observe that, while the greater number of the letters are now found in Scotch, French, Latin, or English versions, all of nearly contemporary origin, there is internal evidence that, so far as regards the extant letters purporting to be written from Glasgow and from Stirling, (five in number,) the Scotch is unquestionably the original and the other versions are translations therefore; while of the three letters without assignable date or place, the extant French bears equally decisive evidences of being the original of the translations in the other languages.

It is time, however, to bring the documents themselves in detail before the reader. We have already stated in a general way that the casket was alleged to have contained two contracts of marriage between the Queen and Bothwell and eight letters, together with a collection of love-sonnets addressed by Mary to Bothwell.

Of the contracts we shall speak hereafter. The case turns chiefly upon the letters and sonnets.

The letters, which already exist in several collections, and have been edited with special care by M. Teulet in the collection intended as a supplement of that of Prince Labanoff, are printed at length by Mr. Hosack at their respective places in the narrative. He has given them in a form which, although not perhaps the most critically correct, is best adapted to the uses of a popular inquiry. The five letters of Scotch original are given according to the contemporary English version; the most important of them all, namely, the long Glasgow letter, being printed from the copy marked in Cecil's own hand and still preserved in the Public Record Office; and to the text of the three French letters, which he very properly prints in his text, he has appended the version which is found in the English edition of Buchanan's "Detection." As it is impossible, within our limits, to print the documents entire, we shall refer to Mr. Hosack's volume the reader who may desire to consult them in their integrity. We must content ourselves with a brief summary of each of the letters, accompanied by one or two of the shorter letters and such extracts of the most important passages of the longer as our space will permit. The reader, with this summary account before him, will, we trust, be able to estimate satisfactorily how far the weight of evidence, internal and external, is on the side of the authenticity of the documents or the contrary.

One of the many embarrassments, as we shall see in the case of the defenders of the genuineness of the letters, is the difficulty of determining the order in which they were written, and especially as regards the two reputed Glasgow letters, of

explaining how both letters could possibly have been written by the same person on one and the same occasion.. The order of these two letters is arranged differently by different editors. They are of very unequal length, one consisting of but a few paragraphs, the other filling nine closely printed octavo pages. The shorter letter is the only one of the entire series which bears a distinct date, being professedly written "From Glasgow, this Saturday [January 25th] in the morning." Many editors regard the longer letter, which has no date, as first in order; but it is certain that the shorter letter was presented first by Murray to the Commissioners at York, and it is printed as the first by Buchanan, the earliest authority by whom the letters were made public. Mr. Hosack has adopted this order, which accordingly we shall follow, and as the letter is short, we shall print it entire.

It appears that with your absence there is also joyned forgetfulness, seeing that at your departing you promised to make me advertisement of your news from time to time. The waiting upon them yesterday caused me to be almost in such joy as I will be at your returning, which you have delayed longer than your promise was. As to me, howbeit I have no further news from you, according to my commissions I bring the man with me to Craigmillar upon Monday, where he will be all Wednesday; and I will go to Edinburgh, to draw blood of me, if in the mean time I get no news to the contrary from you. He is more gay than ever you saw him; he puts me in remembrance of all things that may make me believe he loves me. Perhaps you will say that he makes love to me, of the which I take so great pleasure that I enter never where he is but incontinent I take the sickness of my sore side, I am so troubled with it. If Paris brings me that which I send him for, I trust it shall amend me. I pray you advertize me of your news at length, and what I shall do, in case you be not returned when I am come there; for in case you work not wisely, I see that the whole burden of this will fall upon my shoulders. Provide for all things, and discourse upon it first with yourself. I send this by Betoun, who goes to one day of law of the Lord of Balfours. I will say no further, saving I pray you to send me good news of your voyage.—From Glasgow this Saturday in the morning.

We defer, until we shall have completed our general account of the whole series, all detailed examination of this letter. We shall only observe that the person named as the bearer is Archibold Betown, a servant of the Queen, who was attached to her person for a long time afterwards, and was actually in her service at York and London when the letter was brought forward.

The letter which Mr. Hosack places second in order is much longer, and is full of minute particulars. It bears no

date whatever, but it plainly belongs to the same visit of the Queen to Glasgow, and it is easy, from internal indications, to fix certain points as to the time at which it must have been written.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the direct effect of this, as well as of the second Glasgow letter, and of those written from Stirling, supposing their genuineness, is to establish beyond all question the previous existence of criminal relations between Mary and Bothwell, of a deliberate conspiracy on her part with Bothwell for procuring the death of Darnley, and of her guilty consent and pre-concert with the same Bothwell in her own seemingly forcible seizure and abduction, for the purpose of covering the disgraceful precipitation of their marriage within three months of her husband's murder. The second letter clearly divides itself into two parts, written at different times, and, it is impossible to doubt, on two different days. And of these the first part will be found to bear internal evidence of having been written before the letter already quoted and dated "from Glasgow this Saturday in the morning."

The first part regards her journey. The letter commences with one of the ordinary topics of a love-letter—a recital of the depression of spirits and deep melancholy which followed her departure from Callander, where, in parting with her lover, she had left her heart behind. Until dinner-time on that day she had spoken to no one, nor had any one ventured to obtrude upon her gloom. On her approaching Glasgow, Crawford, a messenger from Darnley's father, the Earl of Lennox, met her, on the part of the earl, to excuse his lord for not coming in person to meet her, alleging that he was afraid on account of the harsh words regarding him—referring no doubt to his share in Rizzio's murder—which she had spoken to Cunningham, another of the gentlemen of the earl's household. Resenting the incivility, she replied that fear in itself implied the consciousness of guilt, and by her words and manner manifested her wish to dismiss all further explanation. Although Sir James Hamilton and others met her, she observed the same neglect of ceremony on the part of the citizens of Glasgow, none of whom came to visit or receive her; and she drew from it the conclusion that, in the quarrel with her husband, they took part with him as against her.

But the important part of the letter is that which gives an account of her dealings with Darnley. She tells of his inquiring of one of her domestics why she did not lodge beside him, alleging that this would have expedited his recovery, and asked whether her visit was intended as a visit of reconciliation; also whether Bothwell was with her, whether she had yet

made her state (that is, the list of her household and establishment), and whether she had taken Paris and Gilbert into her household and dismissed Joseph Rizzio, the brother of David.

At these, and other further minute inquiries of Darnley into her proceedings, she expresses her annoyance. Nothing is said of the precise time of her own visit to Darnley, but the interview between them began by her asking him what he meant by complaining in his letters of cruelty? He only replied vaguely that "he did dreme;" and he then broke into manifestations of exceeding joy and consolation at her visit; but he confessed that he had indeed accused her of cruelty. She visited him a second time after supper, when he declared that his sickness was the result of this cruelty on her part, generally confessing his faults, though he throws the blame on her hardness in refusing to accept his promises of repentance, but denying that fault in particular (probably complicity in Rizzio's murder) which he had always disavowed. In answer to her charge of his always having relapsed soon after forgiveness, he pleads his youth and inexperience, and the example of others who had similarly offended but had been pardoned by her; and he professes now his firm resolve, that, if she will but once more forgive him, he will never sin again. He only asks to be restored to his place as her husband, and declares that if this be denied, he "will never rise from the bed." Although she says she replied to him, she does not give the reply, on the ground that it would be too long to enter into the particulars. We pass over many of the details which follow, in order to come to the most material portion of the letter;—the portion which in truth, if written by Mary Stuart, would exhibit a depth of wickedness and an utter abandonment of moral principle and of human feeling of which history can hardly supply another example. She goes on to describe the horrible duplicity with which she played upon the weakness of the unhappy youth and lulled all his suspicions into fatal security, in order to decoy him within reach of the dark doom to which, in concert with her blood-stained paramour, she had fore-destined him. This passage must be transcribed entire:—

As for myself, he would rather lose his life than do me the least displeasure; and used so many kinds of flatteries, so coldly and so wisely, as you would marvel at. I had forgotten that he said that he could not mistrust me for Hiegate's word, for he would not believe that his ownself (which ~~was~~ myself) wold do him any hurt; and indeed it was said that I refused to have him let blood. But for the others, he wold at least sell his life deare ynoughe; but that he did suspect nobody, nor would, but love

all that I did love. He would not let me go, but wold have me to watche with him. I made as though I thought all to be true, and that I would think upon it, and have excused myself from sitting up with him this night, for he saith that he sleepeth not. You never heard him speake better nor more humbly; and if I had not proof of his heart to be as waxe, and that mine were not as a diamond, no stroke but coming from your hand would make me but to have pity of him. But fear not, for the place shall continue till death. Remember also, in recompence thereof, not to suffer yours to be won by that false race that would do no less to yourself. I think they have been at school together. He hath always the tear in his eye. He saluteth every man, even to the meanest, and maketh much of them, that they may take pity of him. His father hath bled this day at the nose and at the mouth—guess what token that is. I have not seen him; he is in his chamber. The king is so desirous that I should give him meat with my own hands, but trust you no more there where you are than I do here. This is my first journey; I will end to-morrow. I write all, how little consequence soever it be of, to the end that you may take of the whole that shall be best {for you to judge
for your purpose.} I do here a work that I hate much, *but I had begun it this morning*; and you not list to laugh to see me so trimly make a lye at the least dissemble, and to mingle truth therewith. He hath almost told me all on the bishop's behalf and of Sunderland, without touching any word unto him of that which you had told me; but only be much flattering him and praying him to assure himself of me, and by my complaining of the bishop, I have disclosed all, *I have known what I would. I have taken the worms out of his nose.* You have heard the rest. We are tied to with two false races. The *good yeere* untie us from them. *God forgive me*, and God knit us together for ever, for the most faithful couple that e'er He did knit together. This is my faith—I will die in it. Excuse it if I write ill; you must guess the one-half I cannot do withal, for I am ill at ease, and glad to write unto you when other folke be asleep, seeing that I cannot do as they do, according to my desire, that is between your arms, my dear life, who I beseech God to preserve from all ill, and send you good rest, as I go to seek mine, till to-morrow in the morning, that I will end my Bible. But it grieveth me that it should let me from writing unto you of news of myself, much I have to write so *long the same is*. Send me word what you have determined hereupon, that we may know by the one the other's mind for marring of anything. I am weary, and am asleep, and yet I cannot forbear scribbling as long as there is any paper. Cursed be this pocky fellow that troubleth me thus much, for I had a pleasanter matter to discourse unto you but for him. He is not much the worse, but he is *ill arrayed*. I thought I should have been killed with his breath, for it is worse than your uncle's breath; and yet I was set no nearer to him than in a chair *by his bolster*, and he lieth at the further side of the bed.

Then follow a number of memoranda of heads, from which it might appear it was intended to frame the above narrative;

after which this division of the letter concludes with the following gross and unblushing postscript :—

I had forgotten of the L. of Livingstoun, that he at supper said softly to the Lady Reres, that he drank to the persons I knew of, if I would pledge them. And after supper he said softly to me, when I was leaning upon him and warming myself, "You may well go and see sick folk, yet can you not be so welcome unto them as you have this day left somebody in pain, who shall ne'er be merry till he hath seen you again." I asked him who it was ; he took me about the body, and said, "One of his folk that hath left you this day." Guess you the rest.

The Lady Reres here alluded to was notoriously the mistress of Bothwell. Yet the letter makes Mary represent Lord Livingston as talking undisguisedly with this lady of the Queen's own doubly adulterous love for the earl. Further, it makes her represent him as taunting herself upon her visit to her sick husband with coarse and indecent familiarity, banteringly reminding her that "she had that day left somebody in pain, who shall never be merry till he hath seen her again." And all this Mary is made to take in the best part, relates with evident satisfaction, and even takes merit upon with her paramour and correspondent !

The latter portion of this long letter was plainly written after an interval. The writer says she had spent her day, "till two of the clock," in working at a bracelet, which she sends to her lover ; with a caution, however, against wearing it in public, lest it should be recognized by those who had seen her at work upon it. And then, as if her conscience had been stirred by the interval of reflection, she bursts into a paroxysm of remorse. In the midst of this fitful outburst, nevertheless, she resumes her detail of the wily and treacherous devices by which she proposes to deceive him to his destruction ; and, even while she promises blind and unhesitating obedience to the master to whom she yields soul and body, she darkly suggests whether it might not be possible to "find some secret invention by physick," better than that on which her master had resolved to rely. This is doubtless the passage which Mr. Froude had in his mind when he wrote that "one of the letters could have been invented only by a genius equal to Shakespeare." It is too important to be abridged :—

You make me dissemble so much that I am afraid thereof with horreur, and you make me almost to play the part of a traitor. Remember that if it were not for obeying you, I had rather be dead. My heart bleedeth for it. To be short, he will not come but with condition that I shall promise to be with him as heretofore at bed and board, and that I shall forsake him no more ; and upon my word he would do whatsoever I will, and

will come, but he hath prayed me to tarry till after to-morrow. He hath spoken at the first *more pleasantly*, as this bearer shall tell you, upon the matter of the Englishman and of his departure; but in the end he cometh to his gentleness again. He hath told me, among other talk, that he knew well that my brother had told me at Stirling that which he had said there, whereof he had denied the half, and specially that he was in his chamber. But now to make him trust me I must feign something unto him; and therefore, when he desired me to promise that when he should be well we should make but one bed, I told him (feigning to believe his fair promises) that if he did not change his mind between this time and that, I was contented, so as he would say nothing thereof; for (to tell it between us two) the lords wished no ill to him, but did fear lest, considering the threatening which he made in case we did agree together, he would make them feel the small account they have made of him, and that he would persuade me to pursue some of them, and for this respect should be in jealousy if { by-and-by } without their knowledge I did break the game made to the contrary in their presence. And he said unto me very pleasant and merry, "Think you that they do the more esteem you therefore? But I am glad that you have talked to me of the lords. I hope that you desire now that we shall live a happy life; for if it were otherwise, it could not be but greater inconvenience should happen to us both than you think. But I will do now whatsoever you will have me do. I will love all those that you shall love, and so as you make them to love me also. For so as they seek not my life I love them all equally." Thereupon I have willed this bearer to tell you many pretty things; for I have too much to write, and it is late, and I trust him upon your word. To be short, he will go any where upon my word. Alas! I never deceived anybody; but I remit myself wholly to your will, and send me word what I shall do, and whatsoever happen to me, I will obey you. Think also if you will not find some invention more secret by physick, for he is to take physick at Craigmillar, and the bath also, and shall not come forth of long time. To be short, for that I can learn he hath great suspicion, and yet, nevertheless, trusteth upon my word, but not tell me as yet anything: howbeit, if you will that I shall avow him, I will know all of him; but I shall never be willing to beguile one who putteth his trust in me. Nevertheless, you may do all, and do not esteem me the less therefore, for you are the cause thereof. For, for my own revenge, I would not do it. He giveth me certain charges (and these strong) of that that I fear even to say that his faults be published; but there be that commit some secret faults, and fear not to have them spoken of so lowdely, and that there is speech of greate and small, and even touching the Lady Reres, he said, "God grant that she serve you to your honour;" and that any may not think, nor he either, that mine own power was not in myself, seeing I did refuse his offers. To conclude, for assuerty he mistrusteth her of that ye know, and for his life. But in the end, after I had spoken two or three good words to him, he was very merry and glad. I have not seen him this night for ending your bracelet,

but I can find no clasps for it; it is ready thereunto, and yet I fear lest it should bring you ill hap, or that it should be known if you were hurt. Send me word whether you will have it, and more money, and when I shall return, and how far I may speak. *Now, as far as I perceive,*
{ Pay bien la vogue avec vous. }
{ I may do much without you. } *Guess you whither I shall not be suspected.*

As for the rest, he is mad when he hears of Ledinton, and of you, and my brother. Of your brother he sayeth nothing, but of the Earl of Argyle he doth; I am afraid of him to hear him talk, at the least he assureth himself that he hath no ill opinion of him. He speaketh nothing of these abroad, neither good nor ill, but avoideth speaking of them. His father keeping his chamber, I have not seen him. All the Hamiltons be here, who accompany me very honestly. All the friends of the others do come always when I go to visit him. He hath sent to me, and prayeth me to see him rise to-morrow in the morning early. To be short, this bearer shall disclose unto you the rest; and if I learn anything, I will make every night a memorial thereof. He shall tell you the cause of my stay. Burn this letter, for it is too dangerous; neither is there anything well said in it, for I think upon nothing but upon *grief if you be at Edinburgh.*

Now if to please you, my dear life, I spare neither honour, conscience, nor hazard, nor greatness, take it in good part, and not according to the interpretation of your false brother-in-law, to whom, I pray you, give no credit against the most faithfull lover that ever you had or shall have. See not also her whose feigned tears you ought not more to regard than the true travails which I endure to deserve her place, for obtaining of which, against my own nature, I do betray those *that could lett me.* God forgive me, and give you, my only friend, the good luck and prosperity that your humble and faithfull lover doth wish unto you, who hopeth shortly to be another thing unto you, for the reward of my pains. *I have not made one word,* and it is very late, although I should never be weary in writing to you, yet will I end, after kissing of your hands. Excuse my evil writing, and read it over twice. Excuse also that I scribbled, for I had yesternight no paper, when I took the paper of a memorial. Pray remember your friend, and write unto her, and often. Love me always as I shall love you.

One of the most important circumstances connected with this letter is the time at which it was written; or we should rather say, the times, for it bears evidence of having been composed at intervals. It is, as we have said, without date, but it supplies materials from which the chronology of its composition may be determined with tolerable accuracy. The Queen certainly did not arrive in Glasgow on Thursday, January 23rd. Now the letter was not begun till, at the earliest, the following day, since the writer speaks in the very beginning of the King's having sent "yesterday" for Joachim, to inquire about her arrival; nor was this portion of it completed till late at night, "when other folke be asleep," the sequel being deferred "till to-morrow in the morning,"

when the writer promises "to end her bylle" (letter). Hence the second division of the letter was not written till, at the earliest, Saturday, January 24th; and indeed this is indicated in the letter itself, where the writer says that the King has prayed her to defer her return journey (which is known to have been on Monday, the 27th) "till the day after to-morrow." Further, the letter cannot have been finished until a late hour on Saturday, 25th. The writer had been engaged up to "two of the clock" on that day in making the bracelet, and the writing of the letter was carried on far into the night. She "had not seen the King *this night*, for ending the bracelet;" and she closes with the declaration that "*it is very late*, although she would never be weary in writing to him." We pray the reader, therefore, to bear in mind that, from these clear and unquestionable indications contained in the letter itself, it is made plain that the letter could not have been finished until late in the night of Saturday, January 25th. We merely note the circumstance here, to be used later in the inquiry; inasmuch as one of the most important elements in that inquiry is the comparison of the incidents and dates derived from this letter with those of a confession made by the person who is represented as the bearer of it to Bothwell, namely, a French servant of the Queen, Nicholas Hubert, commonly known from his birthplace by the name of French Paris.

The letters are arranged by Mr. Hosack in an order different from that of Whitaker and the older editors; and there can be no doubt of the judiciousness of his arrangement. The correspondence clearly divides itself into three distinct sets of letters: the letters professing to be written from Glasgow, two in number; those written from Stirling, three in number; and a third set of three, without the smallest indication either of the time or the place of writing, and without a single word or allusion from which it could necessarily be inferred, even though the writer were certainly Mary Stuart, that the person addressed was the Earl of Bothwell. In Mr. Hosack's arrangement the last-named letters follow immediately the two Glasgow letters already given. It is to be observed that a comparison of the various extant early versions clearly shows that the original of these letters must have been the French; while that of the three letters from Stirling (as we already said of those from Glasgow) must necessarily have been the Scotch.

The third letter* had (with the exception of a couple of sentences in French) hitherto been known only in the Scotch

* The eighth in Whitaker's arrangement.

version of Buchanan's "Detection." Mr. Hosack has for the first time published the entire of the French text from a contemporary copy in the Public Record Office. It is, in the fullest sense of the word, a love-letter; but, with all its passionate earnestness, there is not a trace in it of guilty love. The writer sends with it, as a present, a trinket decorated with devices and emblems; and a great part of the letter is devoted to a mystic explanation of these emblems as illustrating and symbolizing the writer's affection. We must be content with the concluding paragraph, which we think it well to transcribe, as we shall have to refer to it hereafter.

My only wealth receive therefore in as good part the same, as I have received your marriage with extreme joy, that which shall not part forth of my bosome while that marriage of our bodies be made in publick, as sign of all that I either hope or desire of bliss in this world. Yet my heart, fearing to displease you, as much in the reading hereof, as it delights me in the writing, I will make an end, after that I have kissed your hand, with as great affection as I pray God (O the only supporter of my life) to give you long and blessed life, and to me your good favour, as the only good that I desire, and to the which I pretend. I have shewn unto this bearer that which I have learned, to whom I remit me, knowing the credit that you give him, as she doth, that will be for ever unto you an humble and obedient lawful wife, that for ever dedicates unto you her heart, her body, without any change as unto him that I have made possessor of my heart, of which you may hold you assured, that unto the death shall no ways be changed, for evil nor good shall never make me go from it.

The fourth * letter is of the same general character. There is not a word in the original French of this letter which would show that it was addressed by Mary Stuart to Bothwell. On the contrary, there are passages in the original French which could not apply literally to her supposed guilty relations with Bothwell; and these have actually been *altered in the Scotch version* so as to be converted into evidences of the guilty designs of the Queen and her paramour. We shall make this clear in our detailed examination of the evidence.

The fifth letter is so short that we shall insert the English translation of it.

My heart, alas! must the folly of a woman, whose unthankfulness towards me you do sufficiently know, be occasion of displeasure unto you? considering that I could not have remedied thereunto without knowing it? And since that I perceive it, I could not tell it you, for that I knew not

* Of this, as well as of the first and second, there is, in addition to the Scotch and French, a Latin version. The other letters are found only in Scotch and French.

how to govern my self therein. For neither in that, nor in any other thing, will I take upon me to do any thing without knowledge of your will : Which I beseech you let me understand ; for I will follow it all my life, more willingly than you shall declare it to me. And if you do not send me word this night what you will that I shall do, I will rid myself of it, and hazard to cause it to be enterprized and taken in hand, which might be hurtful unto that whereunto both we do tend. And when she shall be married, I beseech you give me one, or else I will take such as shall content you, for their conditions, but as for their tongues or faithfulness toward you, I will not answer. I beseech you, that an opinion of another person be not hurtful in your mind to my constancy. Mistrust me, but then I will put you out of doubt and clear my self. Refuse it not, my dear life, and suffer me to make you some proof by my obedience, my faithfulness, constancy, and voluntary subjection, which I take for the pleasantest good that I might receive, if you will accept it, and make no ceremony at it, for you could do me no greater outrage, nor give more mortal grief.

There is no clue in any of the extant records to the causes or the circumstances of the complaint referred to in this letter. We shall see, however, that while there is nothing in the letter to connect it necessarily with Bothwell, it is perfectly intelligible if it be supposed to have been addressed not to him but to Darnley. And this, in truth, is Mr. Hosack's theory, not only as to this, but also the two letters immediately preceding.

There remain the three letters which purport to be written from Stirling. On the 21st of April, 1567, Mary went to Stirling with the professed purpose of visiting her infant, accompanied by the Chancellor, the Earl of Huntly, Bothwell's brother-in-law, Maitland, the secretary, and Sir James Melville. She returned on the 23rd, and it was during this memorable ride that, as she approached Edinburgh, she was seized by Bothwell and carried off to Dunbar. The letters in question profess to have been written by her during her stay at Stirling, and were put in as evidence of preconcert on her part with Bothwell in the intended seizure of her person. These letters are so important that we shall print them entire.

Alas ! my lord, why is your trust put in a person so unworthy, to mistrust that which is wholly yours ? I am mad. You had promised me that you would resolve all, and that you would send me word every day what I should do. You have done nothing thereof. I advertised you well to *take heed of your false brother-in-law*. He came to me, and without shewing me *anything from you*, told me that you had willed him to write to you that I should say where and when you should come to me, and that that you should do touching him, and thereupon hath preached unto me that it was a foolish enterprize ; and that with mine honour I could never marry you, seeing that, being married, you did carry me away ;

and that his folks would not suffer it, and that the lords would unsay themselves, and would deny that they had said. *To be short, he is all contrary.* I told him that, seeing I was come so far, if you did not withdraw yourself of yourself, that no persuasion, nor death itself, should make me fail of my promise. As touching the place, *you are too negligent* (pardon me) *to remit yourself thereof unto me.* Choose it yourself, and send me word of it. And in the mean time I am sick, I will differ, as touching the matter it is too late. It was not long of me that you have not thought hereupon in time; and if you had not more changed your mind since mine absence than I have, you should not be now to ask such resolving. Well there wanteth nothing of my part; and seeing that your negligence doth put us both in the danger of a false brother, if it succeed not well, I will never rise again. I send this bearer unto you, for I dare not trust your brother with these letters, nor with the business. He shall tell you in what state I am, and judge you what amendment these new ceremonies have brought unto me. I would I were dead, for I see all goeth ill. You promised other manner of matter of your foreseeing; but absence hath power over you, who have two strings to your bow. Despatch the answer that I fail not, and put no trust in your brother for this enterprize, for he hath told it, and is also quite against it. God give you good night.]

The next is to the same purpose:—

Of the place and the time I remit myself to your brother and to you. I will follow him, and will fail in nothing of my part. He findeth many difficulties. I think he doth advertize you thereof; and what he doth advertize you for the handling of himself. As for the handling of myself, I heard it once well devised. Methinks that your services, and the long amity having the goodwill of the lords, do well deserve a pardon, if above the duty of a subject you advance yourself not to constrain me, but to assure yourself of such place nigh unto me, that other admonitions or foreign persuasions may not let me from consenting to that that you hope your service shall make you one day to attain; and to be short, to make yourself sure of the lords, and free to marry; and that you are constrained for your surety, and to be able to serve me faithfully, to use an humble request, joined to an importune action. And to be short, excuse yourself, and persuade them the most you can that you are constrained to make pursuit against your enemies. You shall say enough if the matter or ground do like you, *and many fair words to Lethington.* If you like not the deed, send me word, and leave not the blame of all unto me.

The last letter also bears on the design and preparations for the seizure:—

My Lord,—Since my letter written, your brother-in-law *that was* came to me very sad, and hath asked me my counsel what he should do after to-morrow, because there be many folks here, and among others the Earl of Sutherland, who would rather die, considering the good they have so lately received of me, than suffer me to be carried away, they conducting

me ; and that he feared there should some trouble happen of it ; of the other side, that it should be said that he were unthankful to have betrayed me. I told him that he should have resolved with you upon all that, and that he should avoid, if he could, those that were most mistrusted. He hath resolved to write thereof to you of my opinion, for he hath abashed me to see him so unresolved at the need. I assure myself he will play the part of an honest man ; but I have thought good to advertize you of the fear he hath that he should be charged and accused of treason, to the end that, without mistrusting him, you may be the more circumspect, and that you may have the more power ; for we had yesterday more than three hundred horse of his and of Livingston. For the honour of God be accompanied rather with more than less, for that is the principal of my care. I go to write my dispatch, and pray God to send us an happy interview shortly. I write in haste, to the end you may be advised in time.

Upon the remaining contents of the casket we shall not dwell. We have already named the two contracts of marriage and the sonnets. The latter, however, would be more correctly described as "a continuous poem, cut up by the translator or editor into pieces of the canonical length of the sonnet (fourteen lines), but without entire success, since the whole was not divisible by fourteen, and the last of the sonnets contains only six lines." The sonnets, if genuine, would reveal, in impassioned verse, the same guilty story which, in the naked prose of the letters, is told with all the calm deliberation of a depraved nature in which the moral sense had been obliterated by criminal indulgence, or its impulses steadily trodden down by the overmastering force of passion. Mr. Burton* well describes this strange piece as "a wild wailing of love, jealousy, and despair. The writer is withheld from the object of her frantic adoration by the double marriage ; nay worse, by his attachment to her rival. And what sacrifice does that rival make, to be set beside all that *she* is prepared to lay down ? If the other gives love, she has love in return. She is protected by the respectable bond of matrimony ; she has been a worldly gainer, for she has been elevated by the favour which the devotion of another has conferred on her husband. And that other—what is *she* not ready to sacrifice ? Rank and position : but these are nothing. Her life, her fair fame, her infant child, her immortal soul—all will be thrown at his feet ! "

We now come to the important inquiry which Mr. Froude has so summarily dismissed—that into the genuineness of these casket papers. To many, with Mr. Froude, it may at first sight appear the wildest excess of "imaginative sympathy" to enter-

* History of Scotland, iv., 434.

tain for a moment the idea of the possibility of such a forgery;—so daring, so vast, so wicked, so unscrupulous, so certain of detection. It may seem a reckless ignoring, not alone of the first foundations of knightly honour, but even of the humblest principles of everyday morality, to conceive a body of knights and nobles of the highest names in Scotland banded together in a conspiracy so foul, so treacherous, and so abandoned. Mr. Burton avows his sympathy with this incredulity, and makes it one of the main grounds of his verdict against the Queen. But Mr. Burton, in yielding to this reluctance to judge unfavourably of the confederate lords in their conflict with Mary, has read to very little purpose the story which he records in his own ordinarily impartial pages. They are judged with much greater perspicacity by one of Mr. Burton's critics,*—no favourer, it may be observed, of the cause of Mary Stuart,—who declares that "history has seldom recorded the doings of worse men than surrounded the throne of Mary Stuart. To the turbulence and selfishness of their ancestors they superadded an audacity of cruelty and treachery peculiarly their own. They had acquired from France a certain hard unscrupulousness which intensified and but thinly covered the natural coarseness of their character!" And he supports his judgment of them in their relations with Mary by recalling their conduct on one or two "crucial occasions" which display their reckless and almost purposeless treachery for the very treason's sake. They murdered Rizzio, he says, "actuated by no better motive than savage envy and a desire to bring back the rebel lords. They murdered Darnley rather than consent to a divorce, to gratify their lust for revenge and to carry out their political schemes. They acquitted Bothwell and signed a bond recommending him as the husband of the Queen. They overthrew Bothwell and deposed the Queen on the ground of this very murder, rousing popular indignation by a picture in which they blasphemously represented the young prince as invoking the vengeance of Heaven on a crime in the guilt of which they had fully shared." The revolting "humbug," he adds, of this last stroke defies comment. He fully adopts Dr. Lingard's declaration that more disgraceful conduct does not sully the page of history; and he concludes that "even if Mary Stuart was in very truth the 'murderess of Kirk o' Field,' our sympathies are rather with her than with men who, under no equal temptation, were at once murderers, traitors, liars, and hypocrites."

* *Edinburgh Review*, vol. cxxvi. p. 259.

Such, even according to writers unfavourable to the memory of the Queen, was, in their public and private relations, the habitual character of the unscrupulous party which was banded together for her overthrow. And in reference to the special cause which they pleaded against Mary—the murder of her husband, let it only be considered, before their evidence against her shall be accepted, what was their own position? Did they come into the cause with clean hands, as Mary's accusers? It is hardly necessary to say that, taking the case against Mary at its worst, the charge against her is but of complicity, while her accusers are themselves the originators and prime actors in the tragedy. Mr. Hosack has stated very clearly and briefly the story of the celebrated conference of Craigmillar, as detailed by two of the parties concerned, the Lords Huntly and Argyll, both Protestants, and one of them the brother-in-law of Murray. According to their account, Maitland of Lethington, and the Earl of Murray represented to the Earl of Argyll that, as Darnley was the great obstacle to the pardon and recall of the Earl of Morton and his friends, the only means of securing this recall would be a divorce between the Queen and Darnley. Argyll replied that he did not see how this could be effected. "My Lord," replied Maitland, "give yourself no concern. We shall find the means well enough to make her rid of him, so that you and my Lord of Huntly will only behold the matter and not be offended thereat." The three then together addressed themselves to Huntly and Bothwell, and, after consulting with them, repaired in a body to the Queen. Maitland, who was the organ of the party, pointed out to Mary that, as well for her own peace as for the public welfare, her separation from Darnley had become unavoidable; and suggested that if she would consent to pardon the Earl of Morton and his fellow-exiles, means might be found to effect a divorce. The proposal was warmly seconded by all the rest; and Mary, although expressing a doubt whether this could be done without prejudice to her child's legitimacy, at first conditionally approved the step, provided the legitimacy of the young prince would not be jeopardized thereby. Of this she was assured no danger need be apprehended; and Bothwell instanced the case of his own parents, in which, although a divorce had taken place, he had succeeded without prejudice to his father's titles and estates. Mary, nevertheless, after reflection, proposed, instead of seeking a divorce, to return for a while to France;—an idea which she had already entertained during the early days of her unhappiness, before the birth of her child. But Maitland opposed this project with

great earnestness; and the words which he used, as well as Mary's reply, are of great importance, as exhibiting the relative position of the two parties in the dark and all but hopelessly entangled schemes which pervade this painful history. "Do not imagine, madam," he said "that we, the principal nobility of the realm, shall not find the means of ridding your majesty of him without prejudice to your son; and albeit my Lord Murray here present be no less scrupulous for a Protestant than your grace is for a Papist, be assured that he will look through his fingers and behold our doings, saying nothing to the same." Against the significant though cautious menace thus conveyed the Queen at once made earnest protest. "I will," she replied, "that ye do nothing through which any spot may be laid on my honour or conscience; and therefore I pray you rather let the matter be in the state that it is, abiding till God of His goodness put remedy thereto."*

Thus, according to the conspirators themselves, the course taken by Mary in reference to this proposal for a divorce was formally to disconnect herself from any unlawful or dishonourable proceeding in furtherance of it; while the conspirators, on the contrary, resolved on the murder of Darnley, and soon afterwards "drew up a bond, in which he was described as a 'young fool and tyrant,' who was unworthy to rule over them, and in which the subscribers bound themselves to remove him by some expedient or other, each engaging to stand by the other in this deadly enterprize at the hazard of his life and fortune." Whether Murray was a party to this proceeding has been warmly disputed. He was alleged to have signed the bond for the murder. This he formally denied; but he went little farther; his protest does not call in question the accuracy of the words imputed to Lethington, but merely denies that "purposes were held at Craigmillar in his audience." Mr. Froude of course gives him credit for not having heard accurately; but when it is remembered that by Paris's first confession (which Mr. Froude implicitly upholds) Murray is distinctly convicted of at least guilty knowledge of the plot, and that his leaving Edinburgh falls in most suspiciously with the very eve of its execution, more impartial readers will feel that the whole course of his conduct fully justified the engagement held out to the Queen by Maitland that, in his own expressive words, "the Lord of Murray would look through his fingers and behold their doings, saying nothing to the same."

It must be added, moreover, that this general imputation of

* See Protestation of the Lords Huntly and Argyle, in Keith, iii. 290.

recklessly unscrupulous treachery against the confederate nobles applies with special force to their proceedings against the unhappy Queen; inasmuch as throughout these proceedings they were impelled by the double motive at once of compassing her destruction by convicting her of the murder, and of screening their own guilt by diverting suspicion into another quarter. Nor need it be inferred from the rude violence and brutality which characterized their age and country that it was only by deeds of violence and blood they could carry out their designs of revenge or aggrandizement; and that a crafty and ingenious forgery, such as that of the Casket documents, would be out of keeping with the spirit, or beyond the capacity, of the supposed actors in the conspiracy. There is unhappily but too much evidence of the subtle ingenuity as well as the unscrupulous boldness with which the arts of forgery were wielded in that age, and by the very men whose footsteps may be tracked through all the successive stages of the dark story of the ill-fated Queen. We have already pointed out numerous examples in a former article of it. A forged correspondence with the Earl of Sunderland was placed in the pockets of Lord Huntly, who was slain at the battle of Corrichie in 1562, for the purpose of compromising the Earl. Randolph, Elizabeth's ambassador in Scotland, produced a forged correspondence of the Earl of Lennox in 1581. Mary's own signature was forged to a warrant for the execution of the Earl of Huntly; and a pretended letter of hers to Bothwell, dated June 15th, 1567, the day after her surrender at Carberry, was shown to her by Kirkaldy, of Grange, and by her indignantly repudiated. That the genuineness of this letter was plainly unsustainable may be inferred from the fact that it was never produced after her denial. She herself, indeed, declared that there were many in Scotland, "both men and women," who were able to counterfeit her writing. Among the women was one of her maids of honour, Mary Bethune. Of men, she herself, in 1568, told Sir F. Knollys that she suspected a Frenchman then in Scotland; and Whitaker enumerates several instances of direct and palpable forgery, which he traces home to the very Maitland who acts so prominent a part in the whole history of the Darnley murder and its unhappy sequel.

Now it is only common justice, in entering upon the examination of the evidence, whether internal or external, of the genuineness of the contents of the Casket, to carry these facts with us into the inquiry. We shall consider separately the external and the internal evidences of authenticity.

I. It is difficult to conceive documents more utterly devoid of external proofs of authenticity.

The Casket documents come to us directly and exclusively *from the deadly enemies of the Queen*; and yet the story of their discovery and seizure as told by them is one which, had it been true, admitted of ample confirmation by *independent testimony*.

(1) The Casket was first produced by the Earl of Morton, as having, on the 20th June, 1567, been seized in the possession of James Dalgleish, a servant whom Bothwell had sent to Sir James Balfour, governor of Edinburgh Castle, with an order for the delivery of the Casket. Balfour, according to the tale, gave up the Casket, but sent such information to Morton as enabled him to intercept Dalgleish and seize the Casket. This story, it is clear, might, if true, have been confirmed by Balfour, by the officer who arrested Dalgleish, and above all by Dalgleish himself. *Now, not one of these was ever produced in evidence*, nor does it appear that a single inquiry was ever addressed to any one of them, in reference to the Casket. On the contrary, as regarded the principal witness Dalgleish, such inquiry was studiously avoided, although every opportunity, and indeed almost necessity, for inquiry arose immediately after his arrest. Six days afterwards, on the 26th of June, he was examined before the Council; but not a word was said about the Casket, its seizure, or its contents. He was detained in prison for upwards of half a year; but, although meanwhile the affair of the Casket had been brought before the Privy Council, and subsequently before the Parliament, and *although the authenticity of its contents had been denied by the Queen's friends in the Parliament*, Dalgleish, who could have placed the matter beyond the possibility of question, was persistently left in the background. In the following January he was tried as an accomplice in the murder of Darnley. Still the same silence as to this damning discovery. And eventually he was sent to the scaffold *without a single interrogatory* on what may fairly be described as the turning-point of the entire story!

(2) The same reticence was observed as to Balfour, and as to the officer who arrested Dalgleish.

(3) Of the letters themselves, two at least, and these the most vital, namely, the first and second, purporting to be written from Glasgow, furnish what would have been a crucial test. Both these letters indicate the names of the respective messengers by whose hands they were sent to Bothwell. The first letter is sent "by Betoun, who goes one day of law to the Lord of Balfours." The person here indicated was Archibald Betoun, a servant of Queen Mary. Betoun could at once have declared whether he had carried any letters to

Bothwell from Mary during her stay in Glasgow. He was in the power of Morton and the confederate lords at the time of the procedure before the Council and also of that before the Parliament. His evidence would at once have silenced the protest of the Queen's friends, at least as to the one fatal letter in which she promises to bring the man to Craigmillar. Now *Betoun was never called before the Council*. Still further: when, at the Commission at York in the following year, the genuineness of the letter was again and still more formally denied, and when, in truth, the genuineness of these letters may be said to have formed the whole subject of the investigation, Betoun was still in the service of the Queen; and to have called him at any moment would have been to put an end, at once and for ever, to all pleas of doubt or denial of the latter; still *he never was produced or even alluded to*.

(4) The second or longer Glasgow letter, on which are founded all the terrible details of that hideous plot, the shadow of which has blackened the memory of the unhappy Queen through all the generations which have since arisen, repeatedly mentions the bearer, and refers to him for particular information on various points indicated in the letter but omitted in detail. The name, it is true, is not expressed; but in all the subsequent proceedings the person alleged to have been the bearer was the French servant Hubert, or Paris, already referred to. We need only call attention to the passages in the letter which allude to the bearer in order to show how intimate must have been that bearer's acquaintance not merely with the facts connected with the transmission of the letters but also with its contents and even with other details of the conspiracy, and of the entire course of the alleged criminal relations between the Queen and Bothwell. It is hardly credible, therefore, that evidence so vital for the proof of the genuineness of the letters and for the whole body of the accusers' cause, could have been overlooked by them, had it been really available, or, at least, had it been producible with safety. It is true that Paris fled in company with Bothwell, and escaped to Denmark, and thus was not in the power of the confederates during the time of the first proceedings in Edinburgh before the Council and in the Parliament, in December, 1567. But this explanation of his non-production is not available for the later periods of the procedure. Paris was delivered up by the King of Denmark, in February, 1568, and remained a prisoner in Murray's hands for about eighteen months. He was in Murray's hands long before the Commission at York and Westminster, and during the entire time of these proceedings, but *he was never pro-*

duced, nor is it alleged that he had ever up to that time been even privately interrogated. Will any one believe that, with the charge of having forged the letters made and reiterated against him, Murray would have failed to produce Paris at York or Westminster, could he have done so with safety? Now *Paris was not produced at York or at Westminster*. On the contrary, even after Murray's return to Edinburgh, Paris was left in prison, without examination, for upwards of six months. At length, the existence of a witness so important having transpired in England, Elizabeth, in the end of the following July, 1569, wrote to require that he should be produced and sent up for examination. It turned out that, just on the eve of this demand Paris, who till then had been a prisoner in the ordinary royal jurisdiction, had, without examination or judicial process at Edinburgh, been suddenly transferred to the private jurisdiction of the Earl of Murray at St. Andrew's, and had there been subjected secretly to examination, not by any official of the Crown, but by the officers of the private baronial court. He was examined on two successive days, July 9th and July 10th. On the first examination he not only persistently denied the carrying of the letter, but also declared that the Queen had no knowledge whatever of the intended murder of Darnley. There was a second examination, which resulted in a detailed confession incriminating the Queen, and bearing out in the broad outline the story of the Glasgow letter; *but this examination was under torture*; and we shall show, when we come to the examination of the internal marks of the authenticity of the letters, that its detailed statements furnish the most complete demonstration of the fabrication. For the present, even taking the most favourable view of the procedure, we shall point to a variety of suspicious circumstances.

First, although Paris, by the very necessity of his own story, must have known all the conspirators in the murder of Darnley, as well as the Queen and Bothwell, his confession carefully avoids the mention of any other individual, and particularly of the other parties to the Craigmillar bond.

Secondly, the confession does not contain the name of the official by whom or in whose presence it was taken. It is not authenticated by the attestation of the proper officer of the court or of the prison, or indeed of any subscribing witness. The document itself, it is true, bears the attestation of Andrew Hay, the clerk of the Privy Council; but that attestation would at best be only evidence of the document's having been produced as a genuine document of the Regent's Court at St. Andrew's, and would in no way lend weight or formality to the original

procedure under which the deposition was taken at St. Andrew's; and in any case Hay's name, inasmuch as he was notoriously a mere creature of the Regent's, could lend but little weight to the deposition even had it been taken in his presence.

Thirdly, the confession, we have seen, was drawn from Paris only by the torture. As soon as this purpose had been effected he was hurried off to execution; and thus, when Elizabeth's demand for his production was received, it was no longer possible to test this irregular and suspicious deposition by a fitting judicial interrogatory.

Fourthly, these suspicions are still further deepened by the fact that Bishop Leslie, in his defence of the Queen, asserts that Paris, when on the scaffold, declared her entire innocence, and thus reaffirmed the first deposition to the same effect which he had made on the 9th of July, and from which he had only been induced to depart by the torture upon the following day.

Fifthly, so plainly unreliable was Paris's second deposition that Buchanan in his "Detection," which was published but two years later, and which heaps together every available fragment tending to criminate the Queen, not only abstained from publishing it *in extenso*, but does not even allude to its existence.

Many of these particulars have been discussed by us on former occasions, in considering the general bearings of the history of the Queen of Scots; but we have found it impossible to avoid recurring to them in connection with the special question of the external evidence of the genuineness of the letters. The last occasion on which we referred to the subject was in criticizing Mr. Froude's account of Queen Mary, in his seventh and eighth volumes, founded as we saw on the assumption of the genuineness of these letters—an assumption the proof of which was postponed to a later volume. It will be necessary therefore to consider the arguments by which Mr. Froude has sought to justify that assumption; and it happens conveniently for the arrangement of the subject which we have been hitherto following, that the evidence on which Mr. Froude here relies belongs almost entirely to that class of external evidence which is now under consideration. We shall transcribe the entire argument, which occurs in one of the notes of vol. ix. :—

I accept them [the Casket papers] as genuine because, as will be seen, they were submitted to almost the entire English peerage, and especially to those among the peers who were most interested in discovering them to be forged, and by them admitted to be indisputably in the handwriting of the Queen of Scots; because the letters in the text [those from Stirling] especially refer to conversations with Lord Huntly, who was then and

always one of Mary Stuart's truest friends—conversations which he would have denied had they been false, and which he never did deny ; because their contents were confirmed in every particular unfavourable to the Queen by a Catholic informant of the Spanish ambassador, who hurried to London immediately after the final catastrophe, for which they prepared the way ; and lastly, because there is no ground whatever to doubt the genuineness of the letters, except such as arises from the hardy and long-continued but entirely baseless denial of interested or sentimental parties.*

Mr. Froude's arguments here detailed are four in number : (1) That the papers were submitted to almost the entire English peerage, and especially to those most interested in detecting the forgery, and by them admitted to be indisputably in the Queen's hand ; (2) that they refer to a conversation with Lord Huntly which he would have denied had he been able, but never did deny ; (3) that they were confirmed in every unfavourable particular by a Catholic informant of the Spanish ambassador ; and (4) that there is no real ground for doubting their genuineness except the denial of interested or weakly sentimental partisans. Some of these arguments we have already discussed in our former notices, but we shall allude very briefly to them all in order.

First, the papers, Mr. Froude asserts, were submitted to almost the entire English peerage, and especially to those most interested in detecting the forgery, and were by them admitted to be indisputably in the Queen's handwriting.

We must refer the reader to our former notice of Mr. Froude for a history of the professed examination of the papers by the Commission at York and at Westminster, which was so scandalously unfair as almost in itself to stamp the papers with the brand of forgery. The story is told in full detail by Mr. Hosack, and also by Mr. Caird, to whose pages, as well as to our own former strictures on Mr. Froude,† we must refer the reader for this part of the subject.

Confining ourselves, at present, to the new argument of Mr. Froude, we shall only say that, even after the many examples of reckless assertion which we have found it necessary to point out in Mr. Froude, we were hardly prepared for so enormous an exaggeration as that by which he represents the Casket papers as having been " submitted to almost the entire English peerage." The transaction to which he refers is a curious one, the history of which Mr. Hosack has very fully elucidated. We can only find room to state that, after

* Froude's *History of England*, xx. 58-9.

† *DUBLIN REVIEW*, vol. iii. (New Series), pp. 113-4.

Mary and her commissioners had vainly demanded to be permitted an inspection of the letters; after Murray had refused even to the English commissioners more than a passing inspection of the originals, chiefly for the purpose of collation with the mere copies which he left in their hands; after Mary's commissioners (all their most reasonable and just demands made in her name having been refused) had retired from the commission; after it had been proposed that the whole case should be brought before the Parliament,—it was at length determined that the results of the conferences should be laid before six noblemen of high rank, the Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Shrewsbury, Worcester, Huntingdon, and Warwick. These six noblemen Mr. Froude magnifies into "almost the entire peerage!"

The only accounts which are preserved of the procedure are in the handwriting of Cecil, and contain alterations and erasures by his hand. It was held in the presence of the Privy Council, and Mary's commissioners also were present; but, although Mr. Froude does not hesitate, without the smallest warrant in the text, to aver in his positive and reckless way that the letters were "long and minutely examined by each and every of the lords who were present," even Cecil's account of the proceeding would show that the examination was neither "long nor minute," but must on the contrary have been hasty and irregular. Cecil expressly states that "it is to be noted that at the time of the producing, and hearing, and reading of all the said letters, there was no special choice of nor regard had to the order of the producing thereof; but the whole writings, lying all together upon the council-table, the same were one after another shown rather by hap as the same did lie on the table, than with any choice made as by the nature thereof, as *if time had so served might have been.*"* And this is what Mr. Froude calls a "long and minute" examination! They were compared, Cecil states "for the manner of writing and fashion of orthography, with sundry other letters long since heretofore written and sent by the said Queen of Scots to the Queen's Majesty; on collation of which no difference was found." But, on the one hand, it must be remembered that the letters of Mary which were made the standard of comparison were themselves produced by Cecil, and are open to the possible suspicion of having been specially selected to support the imposture; and upon the other, that, according to the theory which Mr. Hosack and Mr. Caird, with every show of probability, adopt, three of the Casket letters were *genuine letters of the Queen*;

* Goodall, ii. 258. Hosack, 448-9.

addressed, however, not to Bothwell, but to Darnley, and mixed up with the forged letters in order at once to support the forgery, and at the same time, by the expressions of endearment which they contain, to establish the guilty love of Mary for Bothwell. One thing at least is certain, that this collation of the latter was afterwards challenged as open, not merely to suspicion, but to positive impeachment. "You will per-adventure answer," says Leslie in his Defence, anticipating some future Froude, "that due collation was made." And though Leslie was one of the Queen's commissioners at this "long and minute" examination, he dismisses, contemptuously, the idea of its sufficiency or fairness. "O perfect and worthy collation!" he ironically exclaims, "O most apt and meritorious for such a purpose! As though it is not notoriously known throughout the world that you are her most mortal enemies!" Yet of these very men Mr. Froude ventures to say that they were especially interested in detecting the forgery!

Nor is Mr. Froude justified in saying that the English noblemen who were present at the examination of the papers, such as it was, were agreed in admitting them to be "indisputably in the handwriting of the Queen of Scots." Even if Cecil's account of the proceedings deserved to be received with implicit belief, Mr. Froude, as usual, goes far beyond what its letter will warrant. The utmost that Cecil says is, that "on collation no difference was found;" which need not imply anything more than that no positive proof of forgery was established. But we learn expressly from the Spanish ambassador that, whatever may have been Cecil's representation on the subject, the lords before whom the papers were collated *did not acquiesce* in the views which he sought to have carried. Their opposition, indeed, according to the Simancas despatch, quoted by Lingard,* irritated Cecil exceedingly; and the opinion which they expressed, so far from justifying Mr. Froude's sweeping declaration as to their admitting the letters to be "indisputably in the Queen's handwriting," was guarded in the extreme, and was limited by the express reservation "*as the case now stands*," intended to provide for an opportunity of reply on Mary's part.

Mr. Froude's second argument for the genuineness of the letters, from Lord Huntly's not having denied the conversations which he is reported to have held with the Queen about her collusive seizure by Bothwell on her return from Stirling, is equally infelicitous.

* VI. 94.

In the first place, there is no evidence whatever that the particular letter which contains the allusion to this conversation was ever brought under Huntly's notice. The only occasion on which the letters appear to have been alluded to in his presence, and on which he might be supposed to have obtained any direct cognizance even of their general tenor was in the Parliament of December, 1567. Now on this occasion the reference made to the letters was of the most general kind; and from the excessive reserve which Murray practised, even when he was called on before the English commissioners, we cannot hesitate to infer decisively that no opportunity of minute examination of the several letters in detail was afforded to the Scottish Parliament or to the individual peers.

Moreover the allusion to Huntly, it must be remembered, occurs in one of the Stirling letters—a document of comparatively little importance when contrasted with the terrible revelations of the Glasgow letter. Nothing is more probable than that it should altogether escape his notice; but even if it were certain that the allusion to himself had been known to him, we might content ourselves with the reply of Mr. Caird* that “this perilling of the case on the testimony of Huntly and Argyll is singularly unfortunate for Mr. Froude. ‘Huntly’ and ‘Argyll’ are the *foremost signatures* to the solemn declaration of thirty-five peers and prelates of Scotland in regard to these papers, that ‘the same are *devised by themselves* (the Queen’s accusers) in some principal and substantial clauses.’ ”

We must say, however, that Mr. Froude’s third argument is the most startling of all, in its reckless disregard of even the appearance of plausibility.

He accepts the Casket letters because “their contents were confirmed in every particular unfavourable to the Queen by a Catholic informant of the Spanish ambassador.” The reader has seen how numerous and minute are the incidents, conversations, and allusions contained in these letters; and he will naturally turn with some curiosity to the correspondingly, as he may expect, lengthy despatch of the ambassador, containing the report of this fatal communication from his Catholic informant, confirming the Casket revelations “in every particular unfavourable to the Queen.” Will it be believed that the whole authority for this sweeping assertion is *one short and vague sentence, which does not contain a single distinct fact, incident, conversation, or allusion?* Will it further be believed that the Catholic informant of the ambassador never alludes to the Casket letters or their contents, whether in general or

* Caird’s “Mary Stuart,” Preface to second edition, p. xxvi.

in particular, and that in fact he knew nothing whatever about them, inasmuch as the Casket was not even discovered for nearly half a year after his interview with the ambassador! Above all, will it be believed that Mr. Froude, while he thus assures his readers that this informant confirmed every particular of the letters unfavourable to the Queen, has the amazing folly to print (in Spanish, it is true,) the words of the original despatch; and that these words expressly declare that the ambassador's informant, although distinctly challenged to say what he thought as to the Queen's guilt, *declined to offer any opinion, but although he did not condemn her, yet did not acquit her notwithstanding!**

Against such use of authorities we confess ourselves unable to argue with even the semblance of moderation.

Mr. Froude's last argument for the genuineness of the letters, "because there is no ground whatever to doubt it, except the hardy and long continued, but utterly baseless denial of interested or sentimental partizans," may, in the presence of Mr. Hosack's learned, moderate, and scholarlike volume, safely be dismissed without even the ceremony of a reply.

II. Too little space remains for the second and more important branch of the inquiry, the examination how far the Casket papers exhibit those intrinsic characteristics by which the genuineness of such documents is most satisfactorily tested. Fortunately there is no part of the subject upon which we can refer with more confidence to Mr. Hosack's careful and elaborate essay. Our own intended remarks are unavoidably curtailed.

The letters, as we said, are naturally divisible into three groups; two written from Glasgow, the original language of which appears to have been Scotch; three without mark of place or time, apparently written originally in French; and three which bear marks of a Scotch original, and profess to have been written at Stirling on the eve of the Queen's seizure and abduction by Bothwell.

Among these three sets of letters, all ascribed, from our summary, to the Queen of Scots, Mr. Hosack admits the genuine authorship of the second, the undated French letters, and unhesitatingly denies that of the first and third, the so-called Glasgow and Stirling letters.

As to the three French letters, it will be remembered that there is nothing whatever in them to connect them specially

* "Aunque no la condeño de palabra, no la salvó nada." De Silva's Despatch, quoted by Froude, ix. 18.

with Bothwell ; still less is there any indication of complicity on the part of the writer in the guilty enterprise of that bold bad man. The letters, supposing them to be Mary's, would prove nothing beyond her passionate attachment to the person to whom they are addressed; and Mary's enemies, by representing them as addressed to Bothwell, quite sufficiently effected their purpose of compromising her married honour and of supporting the general charge against her of complicity in the murder of her husband, by exhibiting the guilty love in which that design, according to their view, had its chief motive and origin. Now Mr. Hosack contends, and in this he is ably seconded by Mr. Caird, that the three letters in question are neither more nor less than *genuine letters of Mary addressed to Darnley in the opening days of their married life*, before the hopeless brutality and baseness of his disposition had become apparent, and before his low habits of debauchery and utter degradation of life had entirely torn aside the veil which her early love for him threw for a time over the vices of his character.

As this portion of Mr. Hosack's argument is at once the most novel and the most interesting, we shall confine ourselves chiefly to it. Merely indicating some of the general sources of suspicion of forgery as to the Glasgow and Stirling letters, we shall be content to refer the reader to Mr. Hosack's own pages for a full examination of this branch of the subject.

The writer of the first letter from Glasgow promises that, "according to [Bothwell's] commissions," she will "bring the man to Craigmillar on Monday." Now simultaneously with the Casket letters, Murray laid in evidence before the commissioners at York a "Journal" of the Queen's movements during this momentous visit to Glasgow; according to which she left Edinburgh on Tuesday, January 21st, accompanied by Bothwell, as sheriff of the county, and his brother-in-law, Huntly; she parted from them at Callander on the 22nd; and came to Glasgow on Thursday, the 23rd. Hence, according to the showing of this letter, it was on the 22nd she received the commission from Bothwell to bring Darnley to Craigmillar. Now, unluckily for the consistency of the conspirators against Mary, a commission, which purports to be given on the 22nd by Bothwell to bring Darnley to Craigmillar is plainly incompatible with their own "journal." Eventually Darnley was brought, as is well known, not to Craigmillar, but to Kirk-o-field. Now this change of purpose took place, according to the deposition of his servant Nelson, sole survivor of the catastrophe, solely at Darnley's own desire. Up to "Saturday in the morning" the original commission as to Craigmillar was still, according to the Glasgow letter, adhered

to at Glasgow; and therefore up to that day Bothwell, if this letter be genuine, *expected that he would be brought to Craig-millar*. And yet, according to the entry in the "Journal" for the previous day (January 24th) Bothwell was actually engaged in inspecting the preparations for *receiving Darnley at Kirk-o-field*;—an arrangement which the professed Glasgow letter proves not to have been up to that time suggested or entertained!

A still more palpable incompatibility of the Glasgow letters with the "Journal" and with one another, all which we must say that Mr. Froude most unaccountably ignores or despises, has been indicated in a former page, where we pointed attention to the dates at which those letters must have been written. In the first place, we learn from the "Journal" that Bothwell, on the night of Friday, the 24th, took journey to Liddesdale and did not return to Edinburgh till Tuesday, the 28th. Now the letters, especially the second letter, must have been addressed to him at Edinburgh, and suppose his presence there, as well for the answers which they require as for the execution of the commissions which they communicate.

If it be replied that this may be accounted for on the supposition of Bothwell's having changed his purpose after his leaving the Queen, and that the Liddesdale journey was sudden and unforeseen, there still remains a still graver difficulty as to the two letters themselves, which the reader may already have anticipated from the account of the time and circumstances of their composition, given in a former page. It was shown by the clearest internal evidence that the second or longer letter must have been commenced on Friday, 24th; continued up to a late hour that night; suspended for the night; resumed in the afternoon of Saturday, 25th; and not finally completed until late on Saturday night. On the other hand, the first letter contains the express date, "this Saturday in the morning." We have thus the inexplicable problem of a second letter, commenced, ended, and despatched during the actual preparation of a first, both on precisely the same subject and in exactly the same spirit and tone; and this without a word of allusion in either letter to the other, or a single circumstance connected with either to explain or account for such an anomaly! Moreover, the first part of the longer letter was certainly *completed on Friday night*. It contains many particulars far more important, (in the hypothesis of a conspiracy between the writer and Bothwell,) for Bothwell to learn, than are the passionate complaints and love-sick longings of the short letter. Is it credible that, if Mary had really despatched

any messenger or any letter to Bothwell on Saturday morning, she would not have sent the first portion of the longer letter instead of, or at all events along with, the short letter dated "Saturday in the morning?"

And even were we prepared to admit this, incredible as it is, there is yet another more formidable difficulty arising from a different quarter—the Deposition of the French servant Paris, the alleged bearer of this letter to Bothwell. In order to reconcile Paris's account of this damning interchange of letters between Bothwell and the Queen, during the visit of the latter to Glasgow, it becomes necessary to find time between the conclusion of Mary's longer letter and her final departure from Glasgow with Darnley, (1) for Paris's ride of fifty miles to Edinburgh, (2) for his delay in seeking Bothwell in Edinburgh and awaiting his reply, and (3) for his return journey of fifty miles to Glasgow. Now it is certain that Mary left Glasgow with Darnley on Monday, 27th. We have already shown that the second letter was not finished till late on the night of Saturday, the 25th; and Paris's Deposition shows that he was detained a long time waiting for Bothwell's reply. How is it possible to compress such a series of events into a period of thirty-six hours?

In order to avoid this palpable incompatibility, Laing and Robertson contend, against all internal and external evidence, that the second letter was despatched on Saturday morning. But even this assumption, unwarrantable as it is, will not remove the physical impossibility. M. Wiesener* shows clearly that the length of Paris's stay in Edinburgh awaiting Bothwell's reply, must more than exhaust even the additional day gained by the untenable assumption of his having set out on Saturday morning. We confidently refer to M. Wiesener's minute and careful dissection of the comparative story told on the one hand by the letter itself, and on the other by Paris's Deposition, even the most inveterate hater of the memory of the ill-fated queen.

It would be quite beyond our power to place adequately before the reader another most suspicious circumstance connected with this letter, namely, the inconceivably close coincidence—inconceivable except on the hypothesis of one being directly copied from the other—between the account given in the Glasgow letter of Mary's conversations with Darnley, and a report of the same conversations as repeated by Darnley himself to a gentleman of the Lennox household, named Crawford, who, at the request of Murray, detailed them in a written deposition, *nearly two years after the event.*

* *Revue des Questions Historiques*, Juillet, p. 98.



Mr. Hosack prints the two accounts side by side; and we defy any dispassionate reader to explain the identity of thoughts, words, and order of events which they exhibit, except on the supposition of Crawford's Deposition having been "made to order" and that with a view to sustain the credibility of the letter.

In like manner, we must refer to Mr. Hosack's text for many other minute evidences of fraud and fabrication both in these and the Stirling letters,—minor mistakes of detail which would be impossible to Mary, had she been the writer, but into which a subsequent forger might almost inevitably fall and by which he would as inevitably betray himself. Thus Mary in writing from Stirling is made to send a message* about "many fair words to Lethington;" whereas it is certain that Lethington was *in attendance on herself at Stirling at the very time*. She speaks to Bothwell of Huntly as his brother-in-law—that was, at a time *prior to Bothwell's divorce from Huntly's sister*. The alleged Contract of Marriage between Mary and Bothwell, dated the 5th of April, 1567, speaks of Bothwell's divorce as already "intended and begun," *nearly a month before any step had been taken for the purpose*.

There are many similar difficulties of detail; but we have already more than exhausted the space at our disposal, and it is not without much hesitation that we ask the reader's attention to one curious and important point which still remains—we mean Mr. Hosack's theory as to the alleged fraud on the part of Mary's accusers, in putting forward as evidence of her guilty love for Bothwell three of her genuine letters, which, although really addressed by her to Darnley, they represent as intended for Bothwell.

We beg to recall attention to the first of these letters already referred to. It is the letter which appears third in Mr. Hosack's series, and of which Robertson said, that "if Mary's adversaries forged her letters, they were employed very idly when they produced this."

"In this opinion," writes Mr. Hosack,—

Every one will agree. The reader cannot fail to be struck with the total difference of tone between this letter and that of the two former. The Glasgow letters breathe only of lust and murder. The one before us is written, to all appearance, by a wife to her husband, in very modest and becoming language. She fears some danger threatening his person; she gently reproaches him with his forgetfulness, and with the coldness of his writing; she sends him a gift in testimony of her unchangeable

* *Revue des Questions Historiques*, Juillet, 1868., p. 98.

affection—and it is worthy of notice that she sends it by Paris, who was said to have carried the most important of the letters ; and she finally describes herself as his obedient lawful wife. Is this the language of a murderess? and were these simple and tender thoughts traced by the same hand which composed the Glasgow letters? We believe they were not. We believe that this is a genuine production of the Queen of Scots, but that it was addressed not to Bothwell, but to her husband, Darnley. Her allusions to the dangers which threaten him, her complaint of his neglect, and, above all, her reference to their marriage, all point to Darnley, and not to Bothwell, as the person to whom it was addressed.

No one has asserted that the Queen of Scots was ever privately married to Bothwell ; but we now know that she was privately married to Darnley at Stirling, some months before she was publicly married to him in Edinburgh. In this letter she obviously alludes both to their private and their public marriage—to the one as a past, and to the other as a future, event. The inference is plain, that this letter was written in the interval between their private and their public marriage.

She speaks of the absence of her husband ; but this could not possibly refer to Bothwell, for from the time that she married him until she was made a prisoner at Carberry Hill, which was exactly one month, we know that he never left her for a single day.

The next of these three letters, as it appears in the French original, bears equally plainly the evidence of being addressed to Darnley. But there are in the Scotch version of it (which every critic of the letters admits to be but a version) two notable alterations, which clearly were made with a double object ; first, for the purpose of connecting the letter with Bothwell rather than with Darnley ; and secondly, for the purpose of involving Mary, as the writer, in the imputation of complicity with the intended murderers of her husband.

The remark of Robertson respecting the previous letter appears to be almost as applicable to this. It refers to some matters which can now only be the subject of conjecture ; and it contains nothing from which we can infer that the writer contemplated the commission of any crime. My own impression is, that it is a genuine letter of the Queen, but that, like the former, it was not addressed to Bothwell, but to Darnley.

But it contains one or two passages which bear, or have been made to bear, a suspicious aspect. We have marked these in *italics* ; and on comparing them with the Scotch version of this letter, they will be found to differ from the French, which clearly appears to be the original. In the passage respecting Jason, for example, "*celles*" in the French is rendered into "*her*" in the Scotch, in order to indicate Lady Bothwell, of whom, according to the long Glasgow letter, the Queen was inordinately jealous. This would imply that Mary had been Bothwell's mistress before his marriage, and that she was now jealous of his wife, as Medea became jealous of Glauce ; but no one, not even Buchanan,

asserts that any intimacy subsisted between the Queen and Bothwell before his marriage, so that the alleged reference to Lady Bothwell cannot be the true one. Darnley, we know, gave the Queen abundant cause of jealousy; and assuming that this letter was addressed to him, we cannot but conclude that she here alludes, half in jest, half in earnest, to some Court scandal of the day. We need hardly add that Medea, the "unpitiful woman," to whom she obviously alludes, was not the second, but the first love of Jason. This is just such an oversight as we might expect from a female hand. It is not one that the alleged forgers of the letters, Maitland or Buchanan, were at all likely to have made.

A more remarkable variation between the French and the Scotch of this letter remains to be noticed. The passage near the close which we have marked in *italics* runs as follows: "*Comme l'oyseau eschappé de la cage, ou la tourtre qui est sans compagne, ainsi je demeureray seule, pour pleurer vostre absence, quelque brieve qu'elle puisse estre.*" In the Scotch this passage is rendered thus: "*Mak gude watch.* Gif the burd eschapp out of the cage, or without hir mate, as the turtur I sall remane alone for to lament the absence, how schort yet sa ever it be."

No one can doubt which of these passages is the original; and no one can doubt that the remarkable variation between the two has been made by design. Nothing, in short, can be more clear and simple than the French; nothing more clumsy and confused than the Scotch, the sense of which is made to differ entirely from the original. The words "*mak gude watch*" do not occur in the French at all. Why they have been introduced into the Scotch is abundantly clear. They entirely change the sense of the original by giving a criminal meaning to a sentiment as innocent as ever was expressed by woman. We need not, therefore, be surprised that this monstrous interpolation attracted the attention of Elizabeth's commissioners at York. "The Queen wrote to Bothwell," they say, "especially to make good watch that the bird escape not out of the cage." They only had the Scotch version of the letter before them, and that, they were solemnly assured, was written in the Queen's own hand.

Mr. Hosack holds the same regarding the fifth letter, which will be found entire in a former page.

The internal proofs of this are very strong. The Queen is vexed at the misconduct of one of her women, and still more so at the displeasure of her correspondent, whoever that might be. But can we suppose that a profligate like Bothwell would give himself a moment's thought about the misconduct of a waiting-woman? And can we suppose that the Queen would have applied to him to find her another in her place? Such an application could only have been addressed to her husband. And is anything more probable than that the silly meddling Darnley should have mixed himself up in an affair like this, and caused annoyance to every one by his interference? A recent able writer justly observes that there is a

touch of quiet humour in the Queen's remark, "as for their tongues or their faithfulness to you I will not answer," words which might be addressed most appropriately to her wayward husband.

Here, although the subject of the Marriage Contracts and the still more interesting subject of the Sonnets remain entirely untouched, we must reluctantly pause; the more reluctantly, because we feel that in the attempt to bring into so small a compass a discussion so long and so dependent for clearness upon fulness of detail, we have necessarily failed to do fair justice to the argument. Mr. Hosack's pages, however, will amply supply what has been here overlooked or lightly touched. He has brought to light several new papers of much interest, and especially the original "Book of Articles" presented against Mary at the Westminster Commission, together with the original Minute, corrected by Cecil's own hand of the proceedings of that Commission on the day on which the Casket papers were there presented. In confining our notice to that single subject we have left the general interest of Mr. Hosack's work almost entirely untouched. He has treated with rare impartiality, and with most scholar-like skill and patience, every part of the story of the Queen of Scots, from her birth down to the death of the Regent Murray, in 1570; and there is not one of the many controversies which beset the student at every step, to which he has not brought if not new light, at least the aid of calm, patient, and enlightened criticism. Without avowedly following the track of Mr. Froude, he has had that historian's narrative under view at every point of the history; and he has calmly but successfully exposed many of his inaccuracies, and exploded many of his reckless and unauthorized assumptions.

We shall only add, in taking leave, our earnest hope that the success of Mr. Hosack's present volume may induce him to continue and complete the inquiry. The history of Mary's English prison-life, if it lack the darker and more tragic interest of the wild and bloody period with which the present volume is engaged, is full of memories which no generous mind can recall without deep emotion; and the harsh, fanatical, almost unmanly hatred which pervades the concluding volume of Mr. Froude's history of this unfortunate Queen has so deformed the closing scenes of her life, that we shall look anxiously for some new historian of Mary Stuart's captivity, trial, and execution, who shall prove himself capable of treating the story, if not with generous sympathy, at least with some touch of human feeling and some small measure of discriminating impartiality.

ART. VII.—THE LANDLORD AND TENANT
QUESTION IN IRELAND.

The Irish Land Question Practically Considered. By WILLIAM M'COMBIE.
Aberdeen : D. Wylie & Son. 1869.

The Irish Land Question. By JAMES CAIRD. London : Longmans. 1869.

The Irish Land. By GEORGE CAMPBELL, Chief Commissioner of the Central Province of India. London : Trübner & Co. ; Dublin : Hodges & Foster. 1869.

The Land Difficulty in Ireland, with an Effort to solve it. By GERALD FITZGIBBON, Master in Chancery. London : Longmans ; Dublin : M'Glashan & Gill. 1869.

Land Culture and Land Tenure in Ireland. By PETER MACLAGAN, M.P. Edinburgh : Blackwood ; Dublin : Hodges & Co., and Smith & Sons. 1869.

Studies of the Land and Tenantry of Ireland. By B. SAMUELSON, M.P. London : Longmans. 1870.

ACCORDING to the promise made in our last number we resume the discussion of this paramount question. We have already endeavoured to prove the necessity of bold and vigorous, but at the same time just legislation. We now propose to point out the remedies which, in our opinion, without interfering with the just rights of the landlord, would in a short time produce peace and contentment in Ireland.

In our first article we divided the people of Ireland into two classes. 1. Those who have a direct interest in the land ; and, 2. Those who have not. The first class comprises landlords, tenants, and agricultural labourers ; the second, shopkeepers, artizans, and all other members of the community who are not comprised in the first class. We divided the tenants into two classes : the graziers, who make no agricultural improvements, and the large tillage farmers, on whose holdings, as in the case of Mr. Pollock, the landlord has made all the improvements ; and the small tillage farmers, who, in almost every instance, have made all the improvements themselves. Now it appears to us that in legislating on the land question all these classes must be considered. By a strange perversion of reasoning Mr. Campbell endeavours to prove, in his very able pamphlet,* that the agricultural labourers should not be considered in legislating on the land, and that the landlords and actual occupiers are the only parties to be

* P. 96 and following.

thought of. In order to support this view of the question he tries to diminish the number of the labouring class, and to exaggerate that of the occupiers. He says the occupiers are stated to have been, in 1861, 540,000, which, at the usual calculation of five to a family, would account for half the population of Ireland. He then quotes from "*Modern Ireland, by an Ulsterman*," a statement which estimates the farmers in Ulster at 176,663, and the ploughmen at 15,236. But Mr. Campbell should know, that it is only on comparatively large farms, on which the farmer does not himself usually work as a labourer, that any of the farm servants will be known as the ploughman. On farms of a good size, in the cultivation of which two or even three men are employed, where the farmer labours and ploughs as well as his men, scarcely any of the latter are ever designated by the name of ploughman. In any other sense the statement made by an Ulsterman is wholly incorrect.

Again, Mr. Campbell assumes that every farmer is a married man, and has a family. But this is not true, "for in some counties marriages have almost ceased. In Meath, in 1867, there were only 189; in Westmeath, 131, or about 1 in 420 of the population of those counties, as against 1 in 190 for all Ireland." The total number of farmers and graziers in 1861 was nearly 100,000 less than that given by Mr. Campbell. On the authority of Thom's "*Directory*" the number of farmers in 1861 was 440,882. In the same year the agricultural labourers amounted to 478,916, and other labourers to 386,769, making in all 865,685.* No doubt, a large number of these were domestic farm-servants, who slept either in the farmhouse or somewhere on the premises, and were not married; but certainly a large proportion, probably one half, were married. Emigration may have somewhat altered the proportion of farmers and farm-labourers since 1861, but we do not think it has done so in any great degree. But on this subject we must let Mr. Campbell speak for himself:—

The Irish landlords, he says, being pressed by the farmers, have an uncommon concern for the labourers, and think that these are the people most to be considered. Let us see how far this view is well founded. I may begin with that which would seem almost to render further argument unnecessary, viz., that the universal outcry in the agricultural districts of Ireland is that there *are* no labourers. They have almost all emigrated. Those who remain are masters of the situation. There are three or four farmers running after one labourer. It is a common complaint in many

* P. 99 *et seq.*

countries that farmers are hard masters to labourers ; but in Ireland at present it is not in their power to make hard terms. *The grievance of the labourers is that they want houses and are driven from the land.* It may possibly be said, in their behalf, that the confirmation of existing claims to the land would be in some sense unfavourable to landless persons,—that it would make land dear to acquire for those wishing to become farmers, although they would have much better security when they get it. In truth, however, the labourers do not raise this cry, *they would be much more likely to get the cabin and the potato-ground, which they want, under the farmers (if the farmers were allowed to give it them), than under the landlords ;* and the landlords are the last people who are entitled to raise this cry for them. It is the landlords who are so strongly against turning the labourers into farmers, and who, on the contrary, are so anxious to turn the farmers into labourers. *And it is the landlords who have driven the labourers from their lands in their excessive dread of over-population and poor-rates. Wherever you go in Ireland the most constant practical grievance of the present day is the excessive strictness of the very best landlords in preventing the erection or restoration of labourers' dwellings on the farming lands, or even the reception of any one into the houses of the farmers. In England this clearing of the land has been denounced. In Ireland it is still considered a virtue in the opinion of the upper classes. But I have been assured by several of the best agents of good landlords that, in their opinion the system has been carried too far.* Most of the labourers have left the country altogether ; those who have not *are driven into the towns.* And so far from promoting the gradual formation of a farmer and labourer system, it is now notorious in Ireland that labourers are so difficult to be got, so dear, and so independent, that it is impossible to cultivate profitably with hired labour, and the farmers more and more depend on their own families alone. Rich model landlords build a few model labourers' cottages near their own residences ; but the country generally is closed to the labourer.

We have thought it right to quote this passage without curtailment, because it involves matters of the utmost importance in the settlement of the land question in Ireland. No doubt, a primary object of the minister, in any Measure which he may propose to Parliament, should be to do justice between the owners and the occupiers of land in Ireland. But there is another object not incompatible with this, and of still greater importance to the empire at large, and this is, to make Ireland an integral portion of the strength and greatness of the empire. We quite agree with Mr. Campbell that the grievance of the labourers is that they want houses in the country, and that they are driven from the land. But when he adds that they would be much more likely to get the cabin and potato-ground which they want under the farmers (if the farmers were allowed to give it to them), than under the landlords, he should have said, under the farmers who *till* their

lands, and not from the graziers. We speak of the graziers as a class; for, of course, there are many honourable exceptions; but as a class they are the greatest enemies of the poor and the greatest exterminators in the country. An exterminating landlord is the exception; an exterminating grazier is the rule. Few of the graziers spend one penny on improvements; they give no employment, and, in general, they do not give one acre of their 500 or 1,000 even to the herdsman who takes care of their flocks. Let any man travel over the rich lands of Meath, Westmeath, Kildare, or Roscommon, and he will see the truth of what we state. There are whole parishes in which not a single herd has an acre of land; and not unfrequently when a grazier, more generous than his class, gives an acre of land to his herdsman, he is remonstrated with by his neighbours as setting a bad example. A gentleman asked a grazier lately, who occupies about 1,200 statute acres why he did not give his herd one acre of land; and his answer was, "I pay him good wages, and is not that enough for him?" And yet this grazier is an advocate of the extreme doctrine of tenant-right. He denounces his landlord, although he is as good a landlord as there is in Ireland, and declares that Parliament will do nothing unless it hands over his holding to each occupier in fee-farm, at what he calls a moderate rent; that is, at about one-fourth of its letting value. We are not aware that any landlord has interfered to prevent the grazier from giving a small quantity of land to his herdsman, and consequently the whole responsibility rests with the grazier himself. About half the entire area of Ireland is grass land. The total area in 1861, was 20,815,460 statute acres. The extent of land under grass in 1866, exclusive of meadow and clover was 10,001,244. In 1867 the acreage of corn crops was 2,115,700, of green crops 1,432,410, of meadow and clover 1,658,335, making a total of 5,206,445 acres. The remainder of the area is occupied by waste lands, water, bog, &c. The proportion, therefore, of the grass lands to the tilled lands is nearly as two to one. A great portion of the grass lands is let out in farms of from 200 to 1,000 acres. The same grazier often occupies several farms in different parts of the country. He has his greedy eye on every small tillage farm in his neighbourhood, and whenever it becomes vacant from any cause, he is almost sure to get it, for he is known to be rich; he can afford to pay, if the land be good, a very high rent, for he is at no additional expense, and has no additional establishment to keep up. The farm is turned into grass, the labourers are dismissed, and their cottages thrown down, and the man and dog who took care of the 500 acres take charge

of the twenty or thirty which have been added. The tillage farmer, whose ancestors have changed the barren waste into fertile fields, has been banished with his family, and has gone to swell the ranks of the Fenians in America, and the labourers who worked the farm, being driven from the lands, seek shelter in some wretched slums in the nearest town, and are quickly enrolled in the same confraternity. It is thus that all the rich lands of the country are being rapidly converted into grass lands, the small tillage farmers and agricultural labourers banished from the soil, and the ranks of the Fenians recruited.

But having said so much of the graziers, we must give the landlords their due. In three provinces—Leinster, Munster, and Connaught—they have looked with an evil eye on the small tillage farmer and the agricultural labourer. By the bad landlords they have been ruthlessly and inhumanly exterminated, the others have got rid of the small holders by gentler means; but by whatever means the small tillage farmers have been got rid of, the farms have been consolidated, and generally, wherever the soil was rich enough, grazing has been substituted for tillage. Very often the landlord binds the tenant not to till more than a very insignificant portion of his farm, and not to build any cottage or labourer's abode on it, except that which is required for the herdsman. This principle has been carried so far, that landlords who are in other respects good and humane men, will not permit their tenants, whether graziers or tillers, to build labourers' cottages on their farms, and the result is that the labourers are banished from the soil, and driven, with the most embittered feelings, to take refuge in the towns of Ireland or England, or to go to America. This prevents the employment of labour and the improvement of the land. We know instances where agricultural labourers are obliged to walk eight, and even ten statute miles per day, to and from their work. This is the real cause of the outcry in the agricultural districts—that there are no labourers. Build a comfortable cottage for the labourer on the farm, give him an acre of land to grow potatoes and vegetables for his family, and reasonable wages, and there will be no lack of labourers to occupy them. The farm labourers who are masters of the situation are unmarried men who can live in the farmhouse, and they are masters because the farm labourers with families who must have cottages of their own have been banished from the lands. No doubt, as far as wages are concerned, the condition of the labourer is greatly improved, but no one can say that they are too high. "In agriculture," says Mr. M'Claren (p. 39), "the work is very uncertain; in some seasons, as in spring or harvest, there is a great deal to be

done, and the labourer is generally fully employed; but during the rest of the year the work is scarce, and anything but constant. Hence I found wages at six or seven shillings per week during the busy seasons, and not more than four or five shillings during the winter. I believe that the wages of the agricultural labourer will not exceed five shillings per week, wet and dry, throughout the year."

So far is it from the fact that there is abundance of employment for the agricultural day labourer, that in many of the towns in the grazing districts during the past autumn, subscriptions had to be raised to support their families because they could get no work to do. But if the agricultural labourers were distributed over the country instead of being driven into the Irish and English towns to recruit the ranks of the Fenians, there would be abundance of employment for them in the great and necessary works of draining the country, of reclaiming its waste lands, and in cultivating six or seven millions of acres, which every competent judge declares would be much more profitable if they were tilled by human hands, instead of being given over entirely to the beasts of the field. "Above all," says Mr. M'Combie (p. 10), "the Irish are needed at home. If Ireland is to become what she ought to be—if her agricultural resources are to be developed—it can only be through a largely-increased application of labour to the land. For the half-idle, half-famished population of Ireland, ever merging into beggary, so widely diffused over Ireland, there is abundance of work, could they only be set to do it. . . . There is one point on which no practical farmer visiting Ireland can entertain a doubt, namely, that there is nothing in the physical characteristics of the soil of Ireland to prevent it from offering an adequate field of labour for all the population now depending on agriculture."

The farmers are not Fenians, but the unlimited power over them with which the law invests the landlord, and the numerous instances in which it has been abused to oppress the tenants, has made them sympathize with the Fenians. A just measure of tenant-right would greatly weaken the Fenian cause by depriving it of that sympathy. But should no effort be made to reclaim the Fenians themselves? Mr. Campbell thinks they should be put out of the question altogether. If they are left out of the question altogether, will any measure of tenant-right pacify Ireland? Let Limerick and Dundalk answer. In Limerick and Louth the Fenians would not permit tenant-right meetings to be held until all their brother Fenians who have been convicted of treason-felony should be released. Let Tipperary answer, where the advocate of fixity of tenure

and low rents was defeated by O'Donovan Rossa. The American Fenians are beyond the reach of our *direct* interference, but their hopes of an Irish republic would be at an end, and they would soon become powerless if they had no longer any considerable number of members or sympathizers in Ireland. The Fenians consist chiefly of labourers and the lower class of artizans. We believe the numerous body of farm-labourers who have swelled the ranks of the Fenians have been enlisted through being driven into the towns, where Fenian centres and circles exist. By scattering them over the face of the country, where they would have comfortable cottages and a garden of the extent of an acre of land at a reasonable rent, the link between them and the town Fenians would be broken, and besides, they would have an interest in the soil which would go a long way towards curing them of Fenianism.

It is said that large portions of the highlands of Scotland, from which the small tillage farmers were evicted and the lands turned into pasturage, are becoming wastes, and that, in order to save them, it will be necessary once more to till them. The lands may be reclaimed, but the hardy and noble mountaineers who once tilled them have disappeared for ever. If all the small farmers could be driven from the Irish soil, as they certainly have been driven from the richest portions of it, and the whole island turned into pasturage, we think that this is a policy which, apart from its injustice and inhumanity, no wise English statesman would pursue. "In obedience to a prejudice," says Mr. Samuelson),* "fostered by a hasty expression of the late Earl of Carlisle when Lord Lieutenant, that Ireland, owing to its moist climate, is adapted rather for pasture than for husbandry, *hundreds of thousands of acres have been laid down to grass which are admirably suited for arable cultivation.* The annual average rainfall recorded at Glasnevin is scarcely, if at all, in excess of that of the western counties of England, and below that of some of the best mixed farming districts of the west and south of Scotland. The certainty and luxuriance of the turnip and other root crops in Ireland, which in England are so liable to failure, and the dry, friable soil, our English clays being almost without example, still more than counterbalance the uncertainty, or, speaking more broadly, the absence of the wheat crop, owing to deficient summer heat." Mr. Samuelson is quite mistaken about the wheat crop, which is produced successfully and profitably, not only in the south, but in the north of Ireland. Indeed, he

* P. 7 and following.

says in a note, "I am afraid I have scarcely done justice to the capacity of the soil and climate of Ireland for the production of wheat. A farmer near the town of Tipperary sold a crop of wheat, grown in 1868, on four Irish acres, for £108, at the low price of that year."

Oats [he proceeds] are a sure crop everywhere, even at considerable altitudes, and barley is grown with advantage throughout the eastern [he might have added, and many of the southern and northern] counties. Extensive tracts of land of medium quality, well fitted for mixed husbandry, but which are now laid down in permanent grass, are not only giving a poor gross return, scarcely exceeding in value, even at the present high prices of stock, *one half of what they would produce if under the plough, and yielding no better rental to the proprietor.* . . . I crossed the county of Meath diagonally, from its commencement near Dublin, to its termination at Oldcastle, and I had no difficulty in ascertaining for myself the truth of what I had learnt from practical men of great experience, that, contrary to the popular opinion, only a small portion of its area is really prime feeding-land, *such as would be laid down as permanent pasture in England.* The greater part, though having a limestone subsoil, has undergone the denudation of the coal measures so fatal to Ireland; and its soil consists of drift, varying indefinitely in depth and constitution, generally light and stony, but producing good crops of oats and excellent roots, even at an elevation of 800 feet above the sea-level. Two of the most competent judges in Ireland, of whom I made inquiry separately, agreed almost precisely in their estimate, that of the *ten million acres under grass, forming two-thirds of the area of Ireland, when bogs and waste are excluded, not more than half a million at the utmost are prime feeding-land, and that half of the remainder could be ploughed with advantage; thus nearly doubling the land under tillage in rotation, and adding, at a very moderate estimate, from ten to twelve million pounds per annum to the value of the agricultural produce of Ireland.*

The same intelligent and impartial witness thus vindicates the small tillage farmers:—

Small farms, he says [p. 16], are frequently being vacated on every estate from a variety of causes, and it is important to inquire whether it is desirable that they should be added to adjoining occupations, or whether a new tenant should be procured for them. [He estimates the number of farms of less than fifteen statute acres whose tenants depend on them exclusively for support at 2,000.] The absorption [he says] of one of these farms means the loss of a family from the population of the country. . . . For this reason, amongst others, I made it a special object of my journey to observe everywhere the condition of the small occupiers and the state of their farms. I need not say that it varied infinitely; but it was rare that a holder of from ten to twelve statute acres had not the means of procuring comforts superior to those enjoyed by the agricultural labourer of the southern counties of England. I say he had the means, but I found also

that he rarely exhausted them, but rather laid aside a part as the wedding portion of a daughter, or as a gift to the son who should succeed him on the farm. . . . Not unfrequently I found men of this class who were known to have saved their £150 or £200, or more. I do not speak now of tenants occupying the magnificent dairy farms of Tipperary or of the Golden Vale, but of ordinary light land farms, such as one meets with in Kildare, in Carlow, in Meath, on the medium lands of Limerick, and elsewhere. I took every opportunity of verifying the opinion which I had formed, and I was particularly glad when I found that the accounts of a small farm attached to an endowed school at Oldcastle, 780 feet above the sea level, containing $16\frac{1}{2}$ statute acres, and *rented* at £33, have been kept with such accuracy from 1860 up to the present time as to enable me to ascertain the precise results of its cultivation over that period, including some very bad and some very good seasons. The course of cropping is the usual five-course rotation; and the average return for labour and profit, *after deducting rent* and all expenses, is £75 per annum. . . . I need scarcely point out how much greater the return would have been if a peasant farmer, working for himself, had held this small place, . . . instead of its being managed by a schoolmaster, whose time is necessarily absorbed in his more important duties, and worked by labourers having no interest in the result.

He says the heaviest crops, taking the soil into account, and the cleanest cultivation, he found was on a farm of eleven statute acres in Kildare, held by a youth of 21 years, and tilled by himself and a younger brother, who, together, *support respectably* a widowed mother and two or three sisters. It would take five times the amount of acres in grazing to support a family containing the same number of persons.

Mr. Maclagan (p. 24) gives the full statement of accounts of another small farm attached to a national school at Piltown, on the estate of the Earl of Bessborough, in the county of Kilkenny. The farm is only of the extent of eight statute acres, and the rent and taxes amount to £12. 7s. 4d. per annum. Of course the same remark applies to this farm as to that at Oldcastle, that the profits would have been much greater had the occupier been able to devote his whole attention to the farm. The gross produce amounted to the very large sum of £219. 5s. 5d. on the year, and the net profit was £36. 18s. 1d.; to which should be added, both in this case and in that of the Oldcastle farm, the amount expended on labour, because the tenant of such small holdings always tills it himself, or with the help of his family. We do not know the amount expended on labour in the case mentioned by Mr. Samuelson; but in this latter instance it amounted to £17. 8s. 8d., making the total profit £54. 6s. 9d. It would be a great mistake to imagine that the small tillage farms on

which whole families support themselves respectably, and pay their rents punctually, are let at a cheaper rate than the great grazing farms. The contrary is testified by the *Times'* commissioner and by the other correspondents who have visited Ireland, as well as by the numerous English and Scotch gentlemen who have published pamphlets and tracts on the subject. They all testify that the tillage lands, which are poorer than the grazing lands, are, considering the relative qualities of the soil, almost in every instance let at a higher rent than the grass lands.

Mr. Campbell vindicates the small tillage farmers with equal kindness of nature and ability of argument :—

But whether it is (he says, p. 149) really a good thing further to get rid of our population in order to substitute cattle and sheep, is a much wider question, admitting of great doubts. After all, the greater accumulation of wealth in our country gives greater temptation to an enemy if we have not men to utilize it and to defend it. There was a time when the Scotch Highlands were a great recruiting ground ; now we hardly get a man from them. . . . Already Ireland has, in a great degree, ceased to furnish recruits to the army. . . . If we should put an end to the production of men in Ireland, should we be so strong as if we had a contented population there? Even in an economic point of view, it is hinted that there is some reaction in the Scotch highlands ; that the grass lands which succeeded to the tillage of the cottiers are going back to a state of unimproved nature ; and that both in the Frazer and in the Sutherland country it is found necessary to return to tillage, and to encourage population.

Again, he says (p. 118) :—

In the north-west (of Ireland) it seems that a good deal of land has been cleared for sheep farms, the aborigines being driven to the edges of the mountains and bogs. . . . Indeed, all over Ireland it may be noticed that the best land is generally occupied by the larger farms ; while above and below, *along the edge of the mountains and the edge of the bogs*, one can plainly trace the lines of small thatched farmhouses, where the most petty farms have been reclaimed from the bog and hillside by the labour of the poorest people. If we reproach them with the smallness and poorness of their farms, we must bear in mind that but for them there would have been no cultivated land there at all. . . . No man, however determined may be his opinion in favour of large farms, and however conclusively he may prove by the rules of political economy that it is impossible for any man to keep out of the poorhouse on such farms as the poorer Irish hold, can get over the fact that *hundreds of these small farmers live happily and contentedly if they are only let alone, rear plump and healthy children, pay their way, pay their rent, keep out of the poorhouse, and are altogether most independent men*, who regard the cabin which they have built, and the bit of land which they have reclaimed, with as much pride and affection as

any noble. . . . We call them savages, perhaps justly ; but *they send their children to school, and pay for their schooling ;* and no one can see the rows of healthy, happy children *who flock to school, decently dressed,* without feeling that the system which produces them is not in all respects irretrievably bad. . . . *I cannot but again refer to the absence of pauperism among the small Irish farmers. . . . While both in England and Scotland the constant cry is of the increase of pauperism, it may be said that in Ireland the only recipients of relief are children and sick decrepit people. The workhouses are hospitals and orphanages, and barracks for the soldiers sent to keep down the Fenians—nothing more* (p. 153).

We must quote one other passage :—

The difficulty is that *the small farmers are the very men who have the strongest claims on the ground of improvement,* and the claims which it is most difficult to satisfy by mere compensation calculated from the landlord's point of view. *It is they who have created their little farms from the bog and hillside.* And it is astonishing on how small a farm a steady, industrious man, frugal as an Irishman can be frugal, can live healthily and happily, bring up a thriving family, send them to school, and pay for their schooling. *So long as he can pay his way and does not come on the poor rates, it would seem cruel and impolitic to turn such a man out of the cabin which he values as his castle.* If he breaks down, fails to pay his rent, or comes for poor relief, he may certainly with justice be required to give up the holding, but not otherwise (pp. 181-2).

We have dwelt on two points at considerable length. First, that in any plan for settling the land question the claims of the agricultural labourer should not be overlooked ; and secondly, that the rights of the small farmer should be respected.

But now we must turn to the other side of the question, and see how we are to deal with the large tillage farmers and graziers. As all the writers whom we have read on the nature of the legislation which should regulate the relations between landlord and tenant, take for granted, that in order to be either just or conciliatory, it must regard the past as well as the future, it will be necessary for us to view the matter in the same light, and to consider what legislation is required as regards the past, and what as regards the future. It has been said by Sir James Mackintosh that constitutions are not made, but grow ; and the same may be said of the most just and politic legislation. We find the relations between landlord and tenant regulated, not by contract, but by custom, in almost every estate in the province of Ulster. This custom secures the tenant his holding at a fair rent, so long as he pays his rent, and the right of selling his tenant-right, if he chooses to do so, to the highest bidder, under certain restrictions. This land either descends by inheritance or is disposed of by will. The English and Scotch gentlemen who have

visited Ireland in the autumn for the purpose of studying the land question, have fully mastered the question so far as it secures the tenant against eviction, but have failed to discover how it regulates the rent. We explained this in our last article. The rents have been raised from time to time, but the rise was always general over the entire estate. The rent of any single farm was never raised on the occasion of sale or of succession. Since the establishment of the Encumbered Estates Court, the purchasers of small properties, even in Ulster, as commercial speculations, have in some instances ignored tenant-right altogether; in others, where they permitted the tenant to sell, they have had the land valued, and raised the rent by a few shillings per acre. But this was entirely contrary to the custom on those estates on which, as on the estates of the Marquis of Downshire, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Sharman Crawford, Lord O'Neill, Sir Robert Adair, and other great proprietors in Down and Antrim, and in most of the other northern counties, tenant-right is fully recognized. It is evident that the practice of raising the rents on the occasion of sale or succession, could easily be made to amount to a confiscation of tenant-right. If tenant-right had prevailed as long and as universally in England as it has prevailed in Ulster, the courts of law would have saved Parliament the trouble of legislating on it, for they would long since have declared the custom to have the force of law, and the Ulster farmer would now hold his land like the English copyholder, at the will of the lord, according to the custom of the country, and the tenant's right would have been as firm as that of the lord himself. Mr. Campbell justly wonders that the Irish courts have not long since recognized tenant-right.

But tenant-right is not confined to the northern provinces. It pervades, in one form or another, the whole of Ireland. Lord Portsmouth, Lord Granard, and others, have fully recognized it in other parts of the country. Mr. Campbell (p. 8) gives a copy of the will of a southern tenant from year to year, which shows that he thought he had as good a right to dispose of his farm as any tenant in Ulster. It is worth quoting :—

Ceangalin, June 28th, 1869.

The last will and dying declaration of Jeremiah Sheehan, being in sound and perfect memory, thanks be to the Almighty God for His mercies to us all, therefore I bequeath *my house and land* to my eldest daughter, Margaret Sheehan; also ten pounds more to each of four young daughters, namely, Mary, and Honora, and Catherine, and Nell, out of my holding at Caniguilen.

Also my daughter Margaret, *who is to be the proprietor of the place, is to pay the debts due of the place.*

Witness present:—

DARBY SHEE,
JOHN HARRINGTON.

his
JEREMIAH × SHEEHAN.
mark.

Dated this 28th day of June, 1869.

Mr. Campbell justly remarks (p. 8) that even Mr. Trench, in his "*Realities of Irish Life*," constantly, and, as it were, unconsciously, applies the language of property to the tenure of farms.

"I took as a test case," says Mr. Campbell (p. 9), "the story of one of his heroines. We are told that her father owned a good farm. 'I made inquiries about the girl, and found that her father was *owner* of some eight or nine acres of land, on which he had a comfortable house.' These are Mr. Trench's words. Mr. Campbell adds:—"We are told that she was *heiress to the farm*, and courted as such," and at the end it turns out that the farm was simply held by the year. The truth is that in all parts of the country farms held by this tenure descend by inheritance, and are disposed of by will, the difference being that in Ulster the landlords respect the custom, whilst in the other provinces its observance is enforced by the bullet.*

Although several valuable suggestions have been made by those who have published their remedies for restoring tranquillity to Ireland, not one of them pleases us as a whole. To the system of remedying the evil by forced leases we utterly object. Short leases would not allay in the slightest degree the dissatisfaction of the tenant, and they would be most distasteful to the landlords. Longer leases, say of sixty-one years, would not fully satisfy the tenant, and they would make the landlords, for two generations, mere rent-chargers. Besides, either the leases should be made at the present rents, or there should be a Government valuation of rents through the whole kingdom, each of which plans is liable to such manifest difficulties that we need not delay in pointing them out; not to speak of the prospective confusion which would be caused by all the lands of the country reverting to the landlords absolutely and at the same time, that is at whatever period the statutable lease would terminate. Besides, this would be entirely new legislation; it has not, like tenant-right, grown up and become indigenous in the country.

* See also Mr. Samuelson's statement (p. 36):—"That some form of tenant-right, complete in one part of the country, rudimentary in another, prevails throughout Ireland."

We think, therefore, the remedy is to be found in the substantial recognition of tenant-right, and making it good in law. We say *substantial*, because we think that to pass a law legalizing tenant-right as it exists even in Ulster would be most unwise and useless legislation. It would do nothing for the tenant unless it fixed the rent. We would therefore, as regards the relation between landlord and tenant, legalize a fixed equivalent for tenant-right in Ulster and in the other provinces. We have, moreover, another fatal objection to all the plans before us. They do not define what occupiers are to be affected by the bill, but seem to think that its provisions should extend equally to all tenancies from year to year. Is the grazier, who has never spent anything on the land, who often holds two, three, and even four farms, and some of them ten or twenty miles from his house, to be put on an equality with the tillage farmer, who has reclaimed his fields from the bog, the morass, or the mountain-side? If middlemen were bad as a class (for we speak not of individuals), the graziers are worse. The middleman let his lands at a rack-rent, it is true, but still he let them to small farmers, who preferred having them on these terms to not having them at all. The grazier will not give an acre of land to a poor man on any terms. Some labourers in the county Meath were in the habit of getting yearly from a grazier who held farms which exceeded in extent, we are told, a thousand acres, some eight or ten of these acres at £8 per acre to grow potatoes. Some years ago he refused to grant any more land in con-acre, even at this exorbitant price, and only yielded when he received a threatening notice that his life would be taken if he did not grant the land. Besides, we have shown that two-thirds of the reclaimed soil of Ireland is at present devoted to grazing, a great portion of which would be much more profitably employed in tillage. The graziers, who hold large tracts, will never till any considerable portion of their lands. If they be bound not to divide their farms, tillage will be excluded from them for ever; if they be not, the next generation will see the whole country swarming with middlemen. The truth is, the graziers are a class of small gentry in means and position, who keep their hunters, and not a few of them their carriages, and who have no grievance to complain of except that the landlord will not hand them over the land in fee farm, at what they would call a moderate rent. We will speak of what should be done for the graziers, who hold from year to year, a little farther on.

We must therefore see, in the first place, that justice be done to the tillage farmers, who have either made the im-

improvements themselves, or derived them from their ancestors, or bought the tenant-right of their farms. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it should in all cases be presumed that the improvements were made by the tenant. We think that no limit should be put as to the size of the farm, either on the ground of its being too large or too small, provided it has been *bonâ fide* a tillage farm for the last twenty years. We would not, however, exclude a grazing farm which could be proved to have been originally tilled and reclaimed by the occupying tenant, or by those from whom he derived it; and we would extend the same protection to all persons as to farms the tenant-right of which they or their ancestors had *bonâ fide* purchased. The tillage farmers often purchase small farms not immediately adjoining the farm on which they reside; and on this account we should not require residence, but the lands should not be sublet, they should be *bonâ fide* tilled by the occupying tenant. In fact, we would make the improvements made by the tenant, or by those from whom he derived the farm, the foundation of his tenant-right. Mr. Samuelson (p. 32) estimates the sums paid for tenant-right as ordinarily varying from £7. 10s. to £15 per statute acre. It is by the Irish acre it is estimated in Ireland, and the price ordinarily varies from £10 to £20 per Irish acre, though it often exceeds the latter sum. But such a mode of ascertaining the value of tenant-right would be most unsatisfactory. It never could be ascertained in any instance without actually selling the right; and if the landlord wanted the land himself, or the agent, who would dare to outbid either of them, and to become a tenant on the estate under such circumstances? On the other hand, any rich independent man who might have had a dispute with the landlord could either prevent him from getting the land at all, or force him to buy the tenant-right at three or four times its value. We would therefore establish a uniform law for Ulster: that in all cases where the landlord himself does not demand the land—that is, when the tenant himself either voluntarily wishes to dispose of his land, or is forced to do so for non-payment of rent or any other cause, he should be allowed to sell it according to the custom, and subject to no other restrictions except that neither he nor the purchaser can subdivide without the landlord's consent; because, as we would make arrears of rent in all cases a first charge on the tenant-right, the landlord would always be sure of his rent. If the landlord himself demanded the land for any reasonable purpose, we would give it to him at eight years' purchase of the rent, which is far below what it would fetch in the market; but the tenant should make some sacrifice in return for the

security which he would obtain. If the tenant had manured and prepared his land for crops, and such crops had not been obtained according to the usual rotation, we would give him the value of such manure. This value should be ascertained by arbitration, and should in no case go back beyond three years. We would extend the purchase to ten years, in case the landlord demanded the land without cause. These provisions should be extended to the other provinces, with this difference: that as tenant-right is not so defined or so universally recognized, nor has the right been so generally purchased by the occupiers or their ancestors, if the landlord himself demanded the land, the purchase should be six and eight instead of eight and ten years' rent. But in truth this would make no real difference, as the landlord would be very unlikely to demand the lands; and in all other cases the tenant should be allowed to sell to the highest bidder, as in Ulster.

The next question is how to fix the rents. For this purpose, and for other reasons, we would require that in future, except in case of non-payment of rent, two years' notice to quit should be given in writing to the tenant. The six months' notice which is now required to terminate a yearly tenancy, is not a law of Parliament but of the courts, which have determined that it would not be reasonable to terminate this tenancy by any shorter notice. Besides, the six months, at the end of which the tenancy shall cease, must correspond with the end of some one entire year of the letting, so that if the letting was originally from the 1st of November, the six months' notice to quit cannot be given after the end of April in any year, and when the time of year at which the letting has commenced is unknown, one whole year's notice is necessary. Besides the judges have determined that when the letting is for a year, and so on from year to year, this gives a two years' tenure at the beginning. Now it is quite obvious that one year's notice to the occupier of a farm, who pays his rent regularly, is not a reasonably long time to allow him to provide himself with another farm, because land is not like a dwelling-house or a shop, which may be had at any time and in any town; a man must often wait a long time before he can find a vacant farm, and must often look for it in a distant part of the country. Except, therefore, the tenant breaks his contract, or does not pay his rent, we think a period of two years is the very shortest which should be allowed to him to arrange matters in his present farm, and to provide himself with a new one. It is with reference to this two years' notice to quit, we said that compensation for unexhausted

manuring and preparation for crops should never go back beyond three years, because, having regard to the usual period of rotation of crops, this would be sufficient.

We would require a notice of the same period of two years to be given in writing to the tenant, before the landlord could raise the rent of any such tenant as we are now speaking of,—that is of a tenant from year to year who has been in possession of a tillage farm for twenty years, or has succeeded to the rights of others who possessed it for that period. This would allow time for himself and the landlord to come to an amicable settlement, and if they did not do so, for the tenant to dispose of his tenant-right and to provide himself with a new farm. If the tenant refused to pay the additional rent he would have the option of either selling his holding subject to the additional rent, or of requiring the landlord to pay him the value of his tenant-right, according to the scale we have before settled, and of any manures or preparations for cropping which may not have been exhausted. This would really cost the landlord nothing, for unless the new rent were above the value, he would find plenty of tenants ready to take the land at the new valuation and to pay him the amount of the tenant-right, which he would have paid to the outgoing tenant. But, in fact, such is the competition for land that no tenant would part with his farm on account of any reasonable increase of rent.

Tillage farmers holding under terminable leases at full rent, where the improvements have been made by themselves or by those from whom they have derived the lands, should at the termination of the lease be considered to be in the same condition as tenants from year to year. Tenants like those of Mr. Pollock, holding under landlords who made all the permanent improvements, should be held to their contract.

The graziers who neither purchased the tenant-right nor can prove that they or those from whom they have derived the lands have reclaimed them and made the improvements, who hold from year to year, should be at liberty to till their lands notwithstanding any verbal or written agreement to the contrary. As to the *past*, in case of eviction or of voluntary surrender of their farms, we would merely give them compensation for permanent improvements. As to the *future*, all landlords and tenants should have power to make permanent improvements, such as to build cottages for the labourers required to till the farm, to drain the lands, make fences, to build suitable dwelling-houses and offices, and to make the other improvements enumerated in our former article. But both landlord and tenant should give two months' notice

before such improvement should be commenced, and if either party objected, each of them should choose an arbitrator. If these did not agree where the amount to be expended did not exceed £100, the matter should be referred to the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, who would choose an umpire, by whom the matter would be decided without appeal. The party bringing the appeal, if unsuccessful, should always be obliged to pay the costs; if both parties appealed, the Chairman should have power to grant or refuse costs. When the amount to be expended at any one time exceeded £100, the appeal should be made in the same way to any of the superior courts. If the improvements were made by the landlord, at the conclusion of the work, he should hand a detailed account of the money so expended to the tenant, and *vice versâ*; and in case either party thought the amount excessive, they should first have recourse to arbitration, and if that failed, they would be allowed to appeal to the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, or to one of the superior courts, in the manner already specified.

The security afforded to the tillage farmer would render him perfectly free to improve his farm without any risk of being turned out or of having his improvements confiscated by the landlord. When the improvements had been made by the landlord, the tenant should have liberty to pay him the money so expended, but if he did not do so, the landlord should be at liberty to charge the amount at the rate of 5 per cent., and to add it to the rent. But if the tenant made the improvements, or if he wished to pay for those made by the landlord, he should be entitled to borrow the money from the Board of Works, on the same terms on which it is now granted for drainage. Of course, if the landlord evicted the tenant, he should pay for these improvements, in addition to the sums due on account of tenant-right, and of unexhausted manuring. We should allow the grazier to make permanent improvements on the same terms; nor, although we would not give him fixity of tenure, would this privilege be nugatory, because it must be remembered that we require a two-years' notice to quit for every tenant holding from year to year. This substantially secures all such tenants three years to begin with. In addition to this, we would inflict on the tyrannical landlord, in the case of the grazier, the same penalty of two years' rent, which we said should be exacted from him in case of the wanton eviction of the tillage farmer. Moreover, it should be looked upon as *primâ facie* evidence that the eviction was without cause, if the notice to quit had been given after the grazier had commenced to till his lands, or had given notice of improvements. The same should hold

concerning the raising of the rents, of which two years' notice should be given to the grazier. In case such notice were given to prevent cultivation or improvements, the grazier should have the option of demanding two years' rent, and giving up his holding, or of accepting the increased rent; and the serving of such notice to quit after the grazier had commenced to till his farm or to make improvements, should be *primâ facie* evidence that it was without cause. The serving of notice to quit on a tenant not in arrears of rent, no legal proceedings having been taken in consequence of such notice, should be regarded as conclusive evidence that such notice was given to prevent the tenant from tilling or improving his land; and in case he did actually till one-third of any farm, or make any considerable improvements, he should, in case of eviction or of the raising of his rent, be entitled to two years' rent, unless in the latter case he preferred to continue at the increased rent.

Thus, without instituting commissions or arbitration courts, or handing over the fee of the land to the tenants, or doing any injury to the landlord, or asking the taxpayer for anything, we think it would be possible satisfactorily to settle the relations between landlord and tenant in a way that would certainly be beneficial, and which we think should be satisfactory to both.

But we have already stated, and we repeat that the most satisfactory settlement of the land question would not restore peace and contentment to Ireland. The next thing we would require would be to give employment to the day labourers, numbers of whom, except in harvest time, are still without employment. The surplus of the money derived from the disendowment of the Irish Church could be devoted to no purpose at once so useful and so national as that of the arterial drainage and the reclaiming of the waste lands of Ireland. The landlords should be obliged to pay for the former to the amount of the improvement it would afford to their respective estates. The owners of waste lands, which they shall not, within six months from the passing of the Land Act, have commenced to reclaim, should be obliged to sell them to the State.

The lands reclaimed by the State should be divided into farms of not less than twenty, and not more than fifty, Irish acres, and sold to tenants who should be bound to reside on their farms. They should be obliged to pay one-third of the purchase-money, the remainder to be secured on the farm. The Church lands, so far as they are unlet, should be disposed of in the same manner. The London Companies should be obliged to sell their lands to Government, which should dis-

pose of them to resident farmers in the way already specified. The great want of Ireland is land for all who want it. It is said, no more than God has given can be made. We think the means we have pointed out will create seven millions of acres; three of which would be gained from the bogs and wastes, and four from the grass land.

This new voluntary arrangement regarding the land would offer a fair opportunity to all those who, having acquired money by honest industry, wish to obtain a farm in the country on which they may end their days in rural tranquillity. It would revive the trade of the shopkeepers of the decayed country towns, by creating a large rural population of tenant farmers and labourers, who would resort to the nearest shopkeepers. It would give employment to the small tradesmen; for, whilst the graziers and large farmers go to the metropolis of the kingdom or of the province for their necessities, the small farmers and labourers would be content to procure them at the nearest country town; and for these reasons we think the legislation we propose would benefit all classes of the community.

ART. VIII.—INFALLIBILITY AND THE COUNCIL.

The Œcumenical Council and the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. London: Longmans.

The Pope and the Council. By JANUS. Authorized translation from the German. London: Rivingtons.

Du Concile Général et de la Paix religieuse. Par Mgr. MARET, Évêque de Sura. Paris: Plon.

Le Correspondant, 10 Octobre, 1869. Paris: Douniol.

Observations sur la Controverse soulevée relativement à la Définition de l'Infaillibilité. Par Mgr. DUPANLOUP, Évêque d'Orléans.

IN our article on "the coming Council," in October, 1868, we spoke with great reserve (p. 520) on the question, whether the doctrine of infallibility were likely to come into discussion. The "Æterni Patris" made no reference to that doctrine, nor were we aware of any other ground for anticipating any conciliar consideration of the subject. Since that article was written however, one indication has rapidly succeeded another; and now, after the Pastorals of Mgr. Dechamps and our own Archbishop, it seems hardly possible to doubt that the question will be mooted at Rome.

On the other hand, that the enormous majority of Catholic bishops consider infallibility to be vested in the Holy See, is doubted by no man. As Archbishop Manning observes (p. 27), those even among Catholic laymen who disbelieve that doctrine are a mere "handful of Catholics." The discussion at Rome therefore will mainly turn on the issue, whether the present moment is opportune for a definition. Archbishop Manning has expressed most forcibly (pp. 38-54) the reasons which weigh with many, so far as their own individual judgment is concerned, as strongly enforcing this opportuneness. At the same time he expresses (p. 26) their unanimous feeling as regards the deference due on this head to the Vatican Council.

If the Council should decide contrary to their previous judgment, they would rejoice to be corrected by its unerring guidance ; if it should refrain from pronouncing on matters on which they previously believed a decision to be opportune or even necessary, they would with their whole heart submit their judgment, and believe that such a decision would be not only not necessary, but not even opportune. In this sense of perfect submission, springing from faith in the perpetual and infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit, all Catholics will await the final result of the first Council of the Vatican (p. 26).

Our present purpose is to lay stress on one particular reason adduced by Archbishop Manning, as leading him to consider that a definition of Pontifical infallibility would be most opportune.

It cannot be said that the denial of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is obscure, unobtrusive, and latent. It is patent, notorious, importunate, and organized. It exists, not indeed in power, as once it did in France ; but it exists still. Its roots are yet in the soil and alive. It exists in a handful of active and hostile minds in England and in Germany, and it has been taken up by Protestants in both countries as a weapon of controversy or of contumely against the Catholic Church, and especially the Holy See. To find or to invent a division among us is their only hope. To foment the least divergence into a conflict is their chief policy. There can be no doubt that Gallicanism affords them their most advantageous attack. Catholics are visibly united on all doctrines of faith, even on the Immaculate Conception ; but on the infallibility of the Pope, Gallicanism has caused a divergence, which Protestants think or pretend to be a contradiction in faith. The combined action of Gallicans within the Church and of Protestants without it, has given to this erroneous opinion a notoriety in the last two centuries, and especially in France and in England, which takes it out of the category of imperfect and innocuous errors which may be left to evaporate or to be absorbed. It has inscribed itself in the history of the Church, and will live on until, by the Church, it is finally condemned (pp. 43, 44).

The argument which we would submit is this. On the one hand certain thinkers, calling themselves Catholics, have lately

put forth doctrines on the Church's authority so fundamentally and even violently anti-Catholic ;—and on the other hand certain Gallicans, to whom the name of Catholic cannot justly be denied, have pressed their speculative doctrine to consequences so unprecedented and revolutionary ;—that signal advantage would apparently be obtained by some authoritative and infallible decision on the whole subject, which may suffice at least for practical purposes. We cannot therefore but indulge the hope, that such a decision may be given. As our illustration of those so-called Catholics, who are in truth no Catholics at all, we shall cite Janus's recent work ; and as our illustration of revolutionary Gallicans, we shall take the two writers whom we have named next at the head of our article. In regard to the Archbishop's Pastoral, from which we have made two extracts and hope to make one or two more, we must otherwise be content with saying, that it has even increased the debt of gratitude owing to him from Catholics, not of England only, but of every country where the Church exists.

It will be necessary to notice Janus's work at very far greater length than Mgr. Maret's, because a translation of the former appeared in England almost simultaneously with the original, and has caused some little sensation here. Everything indeed was done by a certain very small but very zealous clique for this purpose. The book was heralded by a grand preliminary and concomitant flourish of trumpets. The "*North British Review*," (concerning which an official announcement has been made by the publishers that it is now conducted by the late Editor of the "*Chronicle*,") published a communicated article on Janus in its October number ; two highly eulogistic articles in the "*Saturday Review*" followed suit ; and then, in the second week of the month, there came a contribution of Mr. Oxenham's to Mr. Murray's new periodical, the "*Academy*." All these writers have united in a kind of triumphant war-dance, to celebrate the victory which they think Janus has achieved, and to rejoice over the unfortunate plight in which he has placed "the Ultramontane faction." Never was triumph more illusory ; and never (we venture to predict) will any triumph have been more short-lived.

We cannot ourselves, of course, profess any reply to the whole book. That could only be done by a book equally large : or rather indeed much larger ; because again and again a flippant objection is stated in three lines, which cannot be gravely answered in less than three pages. Detailed refutations of this or that portion of the work are already beginning to appear in Germany ; and in our next number we shall probably be able to place before our readers an account of considerable work done in that direction. On every side in England we hear learned Catholics, distinguished for their caution and moderation, speak with indignation at the sys-

tematic and gross inaccuracies with which the book abounds. On the present occasion we will consider carefully and (we trust) satisfactorily that portion of the work—a portion, however, much less in magnitude than we expected to find—which contains anything that can by courtesy be called an argumentative or historical objection to the dogma of Pontifical infallibility.

One admirer of Janus has had the courage to say, that in one point only has he “failed to maintain his position *in the very front rank of science*.” It so happened that we had read Janus before we received the “North British Review”; and we must say that such eulogy as this fairly staggered us. Whatever other praise the blindness of party spirit might have induced misbelievers to lavish on the book, we should have thought that in common prudence its warmest admirers would have avoided all allusion to its “scientific character.” So unscientific a composition, professing to be scientific, we never happened to fall in with. And this, perhaps, will be the best comment with which to begin.

We will first give an illustration of our meaning, which is trivial indeed when compared with the author’s other offences against science, but which still in itself is far from insignificant. Again and again he cites some historical fact or patristic dictum, which for many a long year has been more or less a battle-ground between Ultramontanes and their opponents. But he never condescends even to notice the Ultramontane version of those facts or dicta; and he leaves those readers who trust him under the impression, that nothing has been said, and nothing can be said, to give the case a totally different aspect. As we have already mentioned, it is only a small portion of the work which we have read with any care; but we have been quite surprised to find the number of instances, in which he has availed himself of so singular a controversial resource. We will give a few specimens: but it must be understood, once for all, that in pointing out the doubtfulness of his facts, we do not for one moment admit that they would be relevant to his argument were they ever so true.

1. He says (p. 54) that “Celestine III. tried to loosen the marriage-tie by declaring it dissolved if either party became heretical.” Now in p. 61 he mentions Charlas as a leading “adherent of Papal infallibility”; and Charlas gives a totally different account of Celestine’s response. That Pope was asked, says Charlas (*De Libertatibus Gallicanis*, l. 10, c. 16, n. 18), whether a certain woman was bound to live with a husband who had not only once put her away, but (in order to do so) had become a Saracen. He replied in the negative, and most orthodoxly so. What right had Janus to conceal the circumstance, that one of his most distinguished theological opponents denied totally the truth of his alleged fact?

2. Janus brings forward (p. 62) the old story about Pope Sixtus V.'s edition of the Bible: entirely suppressing the fact, that Charlas had replied to this allegation in the very same chapter which we have just cited (nn. 13-15).

3. "Stephen III. allowed marriage with a slave-girl to be dissolved, and a new one contracted." But no less authorities than the Wurtzburg theologians, in common with many others, deny confidently the genuineness of these Responsa. Of this Janus gives the world no hint.

4. The very first instance which Janus gives in "Errors and Contradictions of the Popes,"—and one therefore on which he must be understood as laying peculiar stress,—is this. "Innocent I. and Gelasius I. . . declared it to be so indispensable for infants to receive communion, that those who die without it go straight to hell" (p. 51). But Catholic writers have invariably denied, that such is the true interpretation of what was said by those Pontiffs: nay, to our mind we must say it is a most forced interpretation. Thiel, in his recent edition of Pontifical Letters,* cites S. Fulgentius as saying, that every Christian by *Baptism* becomes partaker of the Lord's Body and Blood: nor, for our own part, have we any doubt whatever that the two Popes are speaking, not of the Eucharist, but of Baptism. At all events, Janus ought to have explained, that a different construction of these words has been given from that which he assumes.

5. There is no testimony of Antiquity on which Ultramontanes lay more earnest stress, than on S. Irenæus's well-known declaration, that all the faithful on all sides must "*convenire ad*" the Roman Church, because of its "*potentior principalitas*." It was perfectly legitimate in Janus to argue, that the passage has no such meaning as Ultramontanes suppose: but it is simply monstrous that he should *take for granted* (p. 87) his own most paradoxical interpretation of S. Irenæus's words. Had he attempted to meet the *arguments* adduced by Ballerini e. g. and Schrader for the other construction, we might at least have respected him as a straight-forward enemy.

6. " 'Whoever does not agree with the Apostolic See,' says Paschal I., *making a spurious citation from S. Ambrose*, 'is without doubt a heretic' " (p. 245). But why did Janus fail to inform his readers, that Paschal II. had no need whatever, for his purpose, of falling back upon a spurious precedent? There is no more celebrated document in ecclesiastical history, and none more constantly cited by Catholic controversialists, than the profession of faith imposed by Pope S. Hormisdas on the Eastern bishops, and long afterwards subscribed by all the Fathers of the Eighth Council.

* *Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum*, p. 329, note.

This profession declares that those "who do not think with the Holy See" are "severed from the communion of the Catholic Church."* What does Paschal's dictum add, beyond this most distinct and authoritative testimony?

We do not speak here of undeniable misstatements: because they belong to a different category, and are such as to deserve a separate article to themselves.

But in fact Janus's unscientific spirit is far too pervasive and profound, to be adequately represented by any number of particular instances: the whole structure of his book is faulty from the foundation. For, consider. He purports to show on historical grounds (pp. xviii, xix) that, since the eleventh century, there has been an "unmistakable decay of Church life, constantly getting a deeper hold and more widely spreading"; that "the ultimate root" of this evil is "the distortion and transformation of the Primacy"; that "the Papacy, such as it has become, presents the appearance of a disfiguring, sickly, and choking excrescence on the organization of the Church, hindering and decomposing the action of its vital powers, and bringing manifold diseases in its train"; finally, that "the doctrine" of Pontifical infallibility, if generally accepted, would be "the final completion" of this evil system, and its "impregnable bulwark." Yet, on the other hand—such is Janus's distinct admission (p. xxi)—"every faithful Catholic is convinced that the Primacy rests on divine appointment"; that "the Church from the first was founded on it; and the Lord of the Church ordained its type in the person of Peter." "It has therefore," he adds, "from the necessity of the case, developed itself to a certain point."

Now suppose for a moment, that a writer of truly scientific spirit had applied himself to the defence of such a thesis as this: what would be his course? He would lay his foundation, by setting forth with unmistakable clearness the doctrine which (according to him) had been taught by the Apostles as revealed, concerning the Church's constitution in general and her Primacy in particular. He would state accurately, what particulars constitute a legitimate *development* of the revealed doctrine on this latter head; and at what point development ends and corruption begins. He would then adduce from Scripture and Antiquity reasons for his judgment; and if a considerable school differed importantly from himself on these questions, he would carefully examine their argumentative grounds. Such a work, however filled with errors and misconceptions, might, nevertheless, do considerable service to the cause of truth; because it would enable the champions of truth to understand precisely their opponent's point of view, and to answer him

* See Archbishop Manning, pp. 86-7.

with the same candour and good faith which he would himself have displayed.

Contrast with this the unhappy writer before us. And first as to the Primacy, which is his principal theme. It "rests on divine appointment," and "the Church from the first was founded on it" (p. xxi); yet "the form which it took depended on the concessions of the particular local Churches" (p. xxiii). We cannot attribute to Janus that confusion of thought, which characterizes such anti-Catholic writers as Dr. Pusey and Mr. Ffoulkes; and we must therefore assume him here to mean, that certain privileges were attached to the Primacy by Christ Himself, and certain others voluntarily conceded to it from the first by this or that local church. Well, we will put these latter on one side, as irrelevant to our theme; and we will only inquire what those privileges are, which were attached to the Primacy by Christ Himself. Until this question is distinctly answered, Janus has assumed no position whatever; yet nowhere does he so much as *attempt* an answer to it. If Mr. Oxenham indeed can be accepted as his representative ("Academy," p. 19), "*the leading idea of the volume*" is partly that "*it is difficult to say exactly how much*" the divine institution "*necessarily involved.*" Janus then can pronounce with certainty (p. xxii) that for eight centuries the divinely-given doctrine was developed legitimately, and "since the ninth century" fatally transformed; but he really cannot say what the divinely-given doctrine *was*. History can tell him how long the true development of this doctrine continued, and when its corruption began; but he searches history in vain to find, what *was* the doctrine thus developed and thus corrupted. Of course, if he *had* committed himself to any precise theory on the subject, he would have exposed himself to an ignominious refutation; so he has taken refuge in silence and ignorance.

But there is a still more fundamental question to be asked. The Primacy was instituted—so he himself declares (p. xxii)—as a "centre of unity"; and it cannot therefore be of divine institution at all, unless *ecclesiastical unity* be *also* of divine institution. Yet, though Janus throughout represents himself as a Catholic, he denies almost in so many words that visible and corporate unity is an essential characteristic of the Church. In his view (p. xxii), "the previously united Church" has been broken up into "three great ecclesiastical bodies, divided and at enmity with each other." Janus holds then, that God included a *centre* of unity in the organization of His Church, but did *not* include therein the *existence* of unity.

But further. Here is a writer, calling himself Catholic, who denies that visible and corporate unity is an essential characteristic of the Church. We are not at this moment however inquiring

how far he deserves the name of Catholic, but how far he deserves the name of scientific thinker. Now it has been constantly maintained by Catholic controversialists, that Catholics from the very first regarded the essentialness of ecclesiastical unity as no less certain a dogma of the Faith than the Trinity or the Incarnation. Quite recently Mr. Allies, in his admirable pamphlet "*Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church*" (pp. 90—115), has most serviceably given a catena of passages to that effect, beginning as early as S. Clement of Rome. He thus sums up his citations:—

As there is one only Christ, so there is one only Church; as the Church is one, because Christ is one, so it is *one Body*, because He has taken a Body: it is therefore the work of His Incarnation, and *to dissolve this Body is to dissolve Christ*; for as Christ cannot be divided, so neither the Church; the Church, as His Body, is the receptacle of His truth and grace. As the Holy Spirit dwelt in Christ upon earth, so He dwells in the permanent order of the Church's ministry, *the perpetual existence of which, in the unity of His Body is the safeguard against error*. Through this ministry, as the joints and ligaments of this one Body, the life of Christ descends from the Head to the members, and Christ's life is Truth and Grace. Thus *the Holy Ghost dwells in the Church permanently*, as in a home, as in a shrine, as in the Body of Christ, as the marriage-ring with which she is espoused as His Bride: but the same Spirit dwells in particular men *only as members of the Body, and so long as they continue to be members of it*; as dwellers in the House, and so long as they continue to dwell in it; as worshippers in the Shrine, and so long as they continue to worship in it. By virtue of this union with Christ, as of the Body with the Head, the Church possesses *the great function of receiving, teaching, unfolding, and preserving the Truth*, and of communicating the Grace by which the Truth is held; and the mode of this union is the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in her, as the Spirit of the Head. Thus, belief in our Lord and His Incarnation is blent and fused throughout with belief in the unity, truth, grace, stability of the Church: the Head and the Body stand together.

Well, we listen to our man of science, Janus, for some kind of reply to this most impressive series of citations; but we listen in vain, and the oracle is mute. Our readers will be slow to credit the fact, but not a word is to be found on the matter throughout the volume. Professing to write a work based on ecclesiastical history, he throws down, crudely and episodically, a statement more violently opposed perhaps to that history than any other which can be named—a statement which must lie at the foundation of his whole theory, whatever that theory may be,—without adducing one syllable either of argument or of history for its defence. Yet of such a book it has been said, by a writer not evidently insane, that on one point only (and that one totally different from the point we are urging) does it fall behind "the very first rank in science."

Then there is a further issue, which would have riveted the attention of any really scientific thinker. Janus denies that God instituted the Church as essentially and indefectibly *one*, preserved in unity by the Primacy. A scientific thinker would have at once inquired, what then *is* the Church's divinely given constitution? *under what circumstances* are bishops at liberty to separate from the Church's Primate? Are there similar circumstances, under which presbyters may separate from their bishop and laymen from their presbyter? These questions lie at the very root of his whole subject: yet it is little to say that he has not attempted their solution; for he has not even caught a glimpse of the fact, that their solution can be expected at his hands.

Our readers then will have seen this writer's intellectual character. He does not aspire to effect a positive historical result, or to investigate the Church's constitution by help of the Church's history: his highest ambition is to bring together from every quarter every material, which presents on the surface some appearance injurious to the Holy See.

We must not fail to enter an energetic protest against this purely negative warfare. In the present day those extreme thinkers, who lay their axe at the root of all philosophy, all religion, and all morality, are mustering in unprecedented numbers, and are cheered to their task by sanguine anticipations of coming victory. We have not the faintest suspicion, that Janus regards their movement with less abhorrence than we do: yet he is directly playing into their hands. If he proposed some theory of his own on the Church's constitution in place of that which he would explode, the case would be different. But he does his utmost to overthrow what is certainly at present by far man's strongest barrier against the rapid and violent inflowing atheistic tide, without attempting to substitute another in its place. If his book could exercise any real power, that power would be put forth in favour of those, whom the author agrees with us in regarding as the most dangerous enemies of every highest human interest.

There is, alas! another issue to be considered, which, as personally regards Janus and his approvers, is even more serious and momentous. In what possible sense can they be called Catholics?

According to Janus, the Church is no longer one corporate society, but on the contrary (p. xxii) divided into three great ecclesiastical bodies:* she no longer teaches one harmonious

* Janus here says, that the Church during the early ages was united, and possessed a centre of unity in the Pope. But in p. 81 he lays down that according to "the ancient constitution of the Church," those admitted by the Pope into his own communion were by no means thereby "brought into communion with any other church." Rather a strange "centre of unity"!

doctrine, but, on the contrary, her constituent parts are "at enmity with each other." Janus frankly professes himself (p. xv) to be "inwardly separated by a great gulf" from multitudes with whom he is in "outward communion"; in fact, from Pius IX. and an enormous majority of Catholic bishops. As regards indeed the Church in communion with Rome, so far from submitting his intellect to her practical teaching, he feels it a sacred duty to revolt indignantly against that teaching, and hold it up to the world's opprobrium. He considers that "since the eleventh century"—that is, for some seven or eight hundred years—a corruption of doctrine has been in progress—not permitted only, but fostered and promoted, by the *Ecclesia Docens* herself—which "hinders and *decomposes* the action of her *vital* power" (p. xix). Nay, so completely has she permitted human inventions to obscure the divine original, that (so far as regards the Primacy) all records of the true doctrine are irrecoverably lost.*

Now, as the Archbishop points out (p. 32), it has hitherto "been believed by all Catholics" as of faith† that the *Ecclesia Docens*, "whether congregated in council or dispersed throughout the world, but in the Successor of Peter always one, is always infallible." In harmony with this judgment, we submit with great confidence that the Church has from the first taught as of faith her own corporate unity and infallibility: though she has not formally *defined* either dogma, for the simple reason that all her children have imbibed and accepted it as a matter of course. We submit accordingly that (even if no more could be said than has already been adduced) Janus and his approvers are as simply heretical, as Arians were before they had been formally condemned.

But more *can* be said than has already been adduced; for Janus denies infallibility even to Œcumenical Councils. Take any Council you please, the question may be raised "whether freedom and unbiassed truthfulness have prevailed among the assembled bishops"; and "on that point *the Church herself*"—i.e. as comprising *priests and laymen* together with bishops—"is the *ultimate judge* by her *acceptance or rejection* of the Council or its decision" (p. 411). And so he completes that inversion of the Church's order, which Gallicans have begun. Gallicans have laid down, that bishops are to teach the Pope; and Janus caps Gallicans, by laying down that the laity are to teach the Episcopate.

* "Propositio quæ assertit 'postremis hisce sæculis sparsam esse generalem obscuracionem super veritates gravioris momenti spectantes ad religionem et quæ sunt basis Fidei et moralis doctrinæ Jesu Christi,' hæretica."—"Auctorem Fidei," prop. I.

† We add the words "as of faith," because the Archbishop's context shows him to mean that he uses the word "believed" in its strictest sense; as "creditum fide Catholicâ."

The Rule of Faith then, set forth by Janus and accepted by his approvers, comes to this. They hold that no other dogmata are to be accepted on the Church's authority as divinely revealed, except those which are unanimously accepted by the members, lay and clerical, of those "three great ecclesiastical bodies" (p. xxii)—the Papal, the Photian, and the Anglican—which jointly constitute the Church of Christ. This is the book of which Mr. Oxenham gravely informs the world ("Academy," p. 18) that its "writers are careful to exclude all possibility of mistake as to the fact of their being Catholic." His words are true in the very opposite sense to that which he intended. The writers *have* "excluded all possibility of mistake" on the subject; and have shown that they are just as much and just as little Catholics, as are Dean Stanley and Professor Jowett.*

* We think it well worth while to extract from the "Spectator" of November 6 the following remarks, for the sake of showing how Janus's position strikes an impartial and thoughtful outsider:—

"If the liberal Catholicism of Janus and his friends is an infallible system, it is an infallible system which has succumbed at once to a false pretence of infallibility on one side, and an openly-admitted fallibility on the other. Now, infallibility which is beaten for centuries, *both* by a sham infallibility and by admitted incapacity for true infallibility, is infallibility of a very novel kind, very difficult to imagine. It looks, at the first glance, very like a rather specially fallible kind of fallibility with a taste for calling itself by grand names. If Janus and his friends are right, no paradox of the Christian faith is half as great as theirs, which maintains that the true infallibility of the Church has not only lain *perdu* for centuries, but has been impersonated by a growth of falsehood without any interposition on the part of the divine source of infallibility. That, we confess,—with all our respect for the wish of the authors of 'Janus' to enter a protest on behalf of liberty and civilization,—we do find an hypothesis somewhat hard even to listen to. A dumb infallibility that cannot find its voice for centuries even to contradict the potent and ostentatious error which takes its name in vain, is that a sort of divine authority to which human reason will willingly go into captivity? But we might sympathize with the authors of 'Janus,' in spite of their utterly untenable intellectual position, if they seemed to us to have any clear advantage in moral earnestness and simplicity over their opponents. But, while there is certainly a school of Ultramontanes that simply and profoundly believes in the infallibility of the Pope, in spite of all the critical and historical difficulties which the Liberals ably parade and sometimes even over-state, we find it hard to believe that the latter believe cordially in any Church infallibility at all. That they are sincerely attached to the patristic theology and are not crypto-sceptics, is obvious enough. But looking to the numerous and difficult conditions which they insist upon as indispensable to any mode of ascertaining what the infallible teaching of the Church—so long suppressed—really is, and the triumph with which they prove that Councils held, or to be held, under far less disturbing influences than the first Council of Ephesus for example (universally held as œcumenical), fail to satisfy those conditions, we can hardly help suspecting that their attitude of mind in relation to the difficulty of ascertaining the infallible judgment of the Church on any theological point strongly resembles that expressed in Dr. Johnson's celebrated

Janus then is an openly anti-Catholic writer; and this is the circumstance on which we lay stress in reference to our general argument. We have already mentioned however that, his work having been translated into English and made some stir in this country, we must review it much more carefully than would otherwise be necessary. We will proceed therefore, in accordance with our intention already expressed, to examine the objections therein brought together against Pontifical infallibility: though such examination must occupy half our article. These objections fall naturally under two classes; the one consisting in a recital of certain alleged individual Papal errors in doctrine, while the other class is based on a broad and general view of ecclesiastical history. The latter is in itself, of course, the more important and fundamental; but we shall better prepare our way for its treatment if we begin with the former.

Janus then diligently brings forward a series of alleged Papal errors, any one of which he maintains to be incompatible with the dogma of Papal infallibility. But the whole of his argument on this head rests on a fundamental misconception of what Ultramontanes maintain; and the chief part of our reply therefore will be occupied with exhibiting this fact. We shall assume, for the purposes of our argument, that corporate unity is one of the Church's essential attributes; and we shall assume also that the dispersed Episcopate, when teaching in connection with its visible Head, is doctrinally infallible. We shall assume these truths, we say, in our argument against Janus, because it is impossible in one article to *demonstrate* everything; and because, though Janus indubitably denies them, yet he has not so much as attempted, either to meet the proofs of them repeatedly alleged, or even to adduce against them one single argument or citation. And these two truths being assumed as common ground, we arrive at such a view as the following: a view which may be held alike by Ultramontanes and Gallicans.

When the Church received from the Apostles charge of the

dictum as to the 'difficult' piece of music which he had just heard. 'Difficult! madam; I wish it had been impossible!' The Liberal Catholics seem to us, in short, to be crypto-Anglicans, who reluctantly accept, in addition to Anglicanism, the abstract principle of a dogmatic infallibility inherent in their Church—an infallibility bound over, however, under the heaviest possible recognizances, never to appear and *claim* the authority it ought to have."

We would only add one comment. The "Spectator" thinks that these men "are sincerely attached to the patristic theology"; but we must maintain, that the very animating principle of patristic theology was belief in the Church's infallible and ever-active magisterium.

Since the above was in type, the "Month" has also quoted this very remarkable passage. We cannot be surprised.

Deposit, she found herself (if we may so speak) teaching as of faith a large body of dogma, which she has ever since enforced as a condition of communion. But this dogma was of far too arresting and stimulating a character, to permit that it should passively remain a kind of *caput mortuum*. On the contrary, a most active intellectual fermentation was ever in process. Whether under the pressure of circumstances or otherwise, one dogma after another was analyzed more profoundly and formulized more clearly; one part of the Deposit was combined with another, or with the dictates of reason, and carried forward to innumerable legitimate conclusions; the sources of tradition were more and more diligently explored; and the Apostolic doctrine in its fulness more adequately understood. As this process continued among individuals, the Church herself found it necessary from time to time to put forth successive definitions; whether by way of analyzing what had always been enforced as of faith, or of declaring what had now been ascertained to be a portion of Apostolic teaching. Nay, after some centuries had elapsed, she found that various errors started up which, without actually *contradicting* the Deposit, were nevertheless seriously injurious thereto; and so her habit began of issuing those minor infallible judgments, which are not definitions of faith. Meanwhile,—underneath these various definitions and as the foundation on which they were built,—the vast and solid structure of Catholic theology has been gradually built up by profound thinkers and active inquirers, who are ever placing in clearer light and exhibiting in wider relations those great verities which the Apostles taught.

It may happen then again and again, that in some earlier stage of theological development, the Church's exigencies require this or that disciplinary decision, before the relevant *doctrine* has been duly explored; before the relevant doctrine, we say, has been brought into consistent and complete shape in all its details. Marriage questions, and again questions concerning ordination, afford abundant instances of the phenomenon to which we refer.* In such cases, the Church's rulers act on that view which appears to them more probable, without in any way imposing that view on Catholics as certainly the true one. The Church issues a command, or a sanction, that such or such a thing may be *done*; but she issues no command whatever, nor is *understood* by any one as issuing a command, that such or such a *doctrine* should be *believed*.

* Take, e. g., F. Perrone's words on the Sacrament of Order. "Whether" ordinations performed by an unlawful minister "are to be esteemed null and void, was formerly a most intricate question," so that the Master of the Sentences calls it "perplexed and almost insoluble." "*Almost innumerable ecclesiastical documents*" may be adduced "for either opinion, *since the thing had not yet been cleared up*. Now, *for many ages*," the doctrine has been determined.—*De Ordine*, n. 136.

So far then, as already mentioned, we are on ground common alike to Ultramontane and Gallican. But here comes in an issue, always of much importance, and just now (as it seems to us) more practically important than ever. We have seen that there is ever flowing in the Church a certain theological stream, which issues in successive doctrinal decisions. We now ask, how is this stream preserved in freshness and purity? What is the Church's security, that her course of theology shall be in the way of legitimate development and not of corruption? In particular, what are those doctrinal decisions which are to be accepted as strictly infallible?

The Gallican answers thus:—"The great divinely appointed security for pure doctrine is, that the various churches shall be in active intercommunion; and that thus Italians and Germans, Irishmen and Spaniards, French and Englishmen, shall supplement each other's traditions, and correct each other's characteristic mistakes. Accordingly those doctrinal decisions are strictly infallible, which have run the gauntlet (so to speak) of the whole Catholic Episcopate."

The Ultramontane speaks differently. Doctrinal purity is preserved, not by the Roman Church consulting other churches, but by other churches conforming themselves to the Roman. The Pontiff, as he is supreme and irreformable in issuing disciplinary decrees, so is also supreme and irreformable in publishing obligatory doctrinal determinations; as he has the right, when he so thinks fit, to command all Catholics what they are to *do*, so he has the right, when he so thinks fit, to command them what they are to *believe*. And more generally, within the local Roman Church is preserved, by special assistance of the Holy Ghost, indefectible purity of doctrine and tradition; in such sense, that she is the standard and source of doctrinal purity to all other churches in Christendom. This doctrinal purity is exhibited, under one aspect, in her indefectible intolerance of *heresy*; in the circumstance that, by instinct as it were, or rather by guidance of the Holy Ghost, she indefectibly refuses all communion with those, at any given period, whose doctrine contradicts what she has taught as of faith. But this doctrinal purity is far more widely extended. Whatever there may be occasionally of incidental and minor mistake, the general course of theological thought within her bosom is ever infallibly sound; and the securest attainable test of theological truth, on a matter not yet expressly determined, is her judgment and testimony.

Now, before we go further, one or two things are manifest on the surface. Firstly, this view is far more accordant than the Gallican with such texts as "*pasce oves*"; "*confirma fratres*." Then again this is certainly the more obvious—as, for our own parts, we are confident it is the one true—interpretation of S. Irenæus's well-known "*convenire propter potentiores principalitatem*."

Moreover, the Ultramontane doctrine exhibits certainly most singular harmony with the whole past course of ecclesiastical history; whereas the Gallican is the merest theory, entirely unsupported by facts. Let us take as our stand-point those various verities, which the whole Church now recognizes as certain. If we look back on the past, we shall find that in every case it was Rome which at once pointed to the true decision of existing controversies; and that other churches have come more surely and more speedily to the truth, in proportion as they have followed with greater docility Rome's salutary guidance.*

From this general view, three consequences at once follow. In the first place, the Supreme Pontiff is infallible in every doctrine, which he commands the faithful to accept with absolute and unreserved interior assent; or in other words, in every doctrine which he teaches *ex cathedrâ*. This inference, we say, necessarily results from the doctrine just laid down. If the Pontiff were *irreformable* in issuing such command of interior belief,—and yet not *infallible* in the doctrine so taught,—the Church herself would no longer be infallible.

Then secondly,—even in cases where no infallible determination has been given,—the endemic and pervasive Roman doctrinal tradition carries with it the very greatest authority, which is compatible with the absence of strict infallibility. This is partly the reason of that humble interior submission, with which the well-instructed and loyal Catholic receives all doctrinal decrees of a Pontifical congregation. Short of the Pope's utterances *ex cathedrâ*, there is no one kind of pronouncement which approaches these, as authentic expositions of Roman doctrine.

But thirdly, there is nothing in the doctrine we have laid down which militates against the supposition, that this or that Pontiff may make a doctrinal mistake, in cases where he is imposing no obligation of interior assent. As has often been urged by Ultramontanes, the Pope in becoming Pope does not cease to be a man,

* The translator of the volume has given an illustration of this, the more valuable because so entirely unintentional. In looking back through all past history for instances in which an episcopal assembly has led Catholics astray, he has chosen (p. xi) the Latrocinium of Ephesus and the Council of Rimini. Now, of all the Councils calling themselves Ecumenical, these are the very two which the Holy See has, from first to last, consistently repudiated.

F. Newman, in his "Essay on Development," did not hesitate thus to speak of what was done at Chalcedon. "A doctrine . . . which the whole East refused as a symbol, not once but twice, patriarch by patriarch, metropolitan by metropolitan, first by the mouth of above a hundred, then by the mouth of above six hundred of its bishops . . . was forced upon the Council . . . for its acceptance as a definition of faith under the sanction of an anathema: forced on the Council by the resolution of the Pope of the day, acting through his legates and supported by the civil power" (p. 307).

and to have his own private opinions : and since he is not infallible in these, by the very force of terms they may be mistaken. Even in the very act of irreformably imposing some doctrine, why may he not state the reasons which have *led* him to impose it? Yet, since it is the *doctrine* which he imposes on interior acceptance, and not his *reasons*, there is no ground for regarding the latter as infallibly just and cogent. So as regards his disciplinary decrees. If indeed any of his decrees at any given period were based on a doctrine, which the Holy See at that period had ruled to be unsound, no doubt a very serious controversial difficulty would arise. But it will happen again and again—as we just now pointed out—that he is obliged to issue some disciplinary decree, say, e. g., on marriage, before the relevant doctrine has been duly explored in all its details: and it may thus possibly happen that the doctrine, which for the purposes of such decree he assumes as more probable, is at variance with that which the Holy See at a later period shall infallibly determine. On the one hand, since Popes are not impeccable, he may be carried away by levity, prejudice, or the like, and act without duly consulting his natural advisers and the traditions of his See. On the other hand, those traditions themselves may at the moment point to some other doctrine as the more probable, which later investigations will even put out of court altogether. That the enormous majority of Janus's instances (assuming for argument's sake their correctness) are precisely of this kind, is obvious on the most superficial inspection of his volume.

See then what Janus has to do, if he would adduce any solid objection against our doctrine. He has to show either (1) that some Pope has imposed on all the faithful an obligation of accepting some false doctrine with absolute and unreserved assent; or else (2) that the doctrinal mistakes, made by Popes when not teaching *ex cathedrâ*, have been such as to invalidate the view we have given, on the indefectible doctrinal purity of the Roman Church. We really doubt whether his warmest admirers will maintain, that he has done anything of the kind. Still we will examine the issue in greater detail.

In truth, the whole foundation of his case is his denial of the distinction, universally and emphatically made by Ultramontanes, between *ex cathedrâ* judgments on one hand, and a Pope's other doctrinal expositions or implications on the other. His argument is, that the distinction drawn by Ultramontanes is purely arbitrary, gratuitous, and capricious; invented for the mere purpose of glossing over an otherwise insurmountable difficulty. Yet surely nothing can be more obvious than their distinction, and nothing more easily intelligible than its ground. The Church's infallibility would be fatally compromised, if Catholics could be commanded by legitimate authority to accept

irreformably a false doctrine: but how is that infallibility compromised in the slightest degree by some Pope incidentally *expressing* or *implying* a false doctrine, where he imposes no obligation whatever of interior assent?

But why, asks Janus (p. 408), should "the Pope be held fallible when addressing himself to a part of the Church, but infallible when addressing himself to the whole?" Surely the answer is very evident. The question is not about "addressing himself," but about *commanding interior assent*. But the Pope never exacts absolute and unreserved assent to any doctrine from individual Catholics, except where he exacts such assent from the whole body of Christians: otherwise he would himself destroy that unity of faith, which it is his very office to maintain. But no Catholic theologian has ever denied, that this or that pronouncement, addressed *formally* to a local church or to an individual, may be in real truth an utterance *ex cathedrâ* obliging all Catholics: as in the very familiar instance of S. Leo's letter to S. Flavian.

Here we should further add, that Janus entirely misplaces, and thereby enormously exaggerates, the difference which indubitably exists among Ultramontane theologians, on the tests of an *ex cathedrâ* Act. They are unanimous in holding that the Pope is infallible, only and always, when his intention is cognisable, of imposing an obligation of absolute and unreserved interior assent. Their differences all turn on the point, what *means* are sufficient for *knowing* the Pope's intention. On this point undoubtedly there is much diversity: and the obvious inference to our mind is, that *no* universal criterion can be laid down; no cut-and-dry rule, which can at once be applied to every instance: but that theologians are often left to judge, from the circumstances of some individual case. This is the Archbishop's inference also. "No other conditions," he says (p. 61), "are required than this: that the doctrinal Acts be published by the Pontiff as Universal Teacher, with the intention of requiring the assent of the Church." Of course, by the very necessity of the case, the Archbishop is interpreted as speaking, not of the Pope's purely interior intention, but of an intention discoverable and ascertainable.

It is physically impossible, within our limits of space and time, to go one by one through Janus's instances of objection. This impossibility indeed does not arise from any surprising *numerousness* of his allegations: on the contrary, considering that a learned and unscrupulous writer was culling from the whole field of ecclesiastical history, it is really amazing that he has been able to lay his hand on so few. Still, to examine them thoroughly, would involve an investigation of the Church's doctrine on Marriage, on Ordination, and, in one instance (p. 55), on the Eucharist. We must necessarily therefore make a selection: but

we believe his readers will readily admit, that our selection comprises all on which he lays especial stress, and all which on the surface appear most formidable.

There is no one case* on which he speaks so peremptorily and so triumphantly, as on Eugenius IV.'s Decree to the Armenians. From this Decree, he says, it follows, on Ultramontane principles, "that the Church, whether Latin or Greek, for a thousand years had neither priests nor bishops; and consequently no sacraments, except Baptism, and perhaps Marriage" (p. 61). It is a decree, he adds, "with which [either] Papal infallibility," on the one hand, "or the whole hierarchy and sacraments of the Church" on the other, "stand or fall." Here at all events we have a large quantity of very tall talk indeed. How far this tall talk corresponds with fact, we are now to consider.

Firstly, we are to inquire whether this Decree was issued *ex cathedrâ*. That it was not *formally* addressed to the whole Church, is of course manifest on its surface. Still there have undoubtedly been very many *ex cathedrâ* Acts, not formally addressed to the whole Church; and our inquiry therefore is, whether this belongs to the number. Long before Janus's work appeared (January, 1868, p. 105 and note) we gave reasons for inclining to answer this question in the negative. Here we will further say, that the onus probandi rests entirely on Janus. The Decree purports to be a practical and catechetical instruction, addressed for their guidance to certain Armenian converts, who were prepared both to enter the Catholic Church and to accept the Latin rite. It has every appearance of being precisely this, neither more nor less: of being such an instruction as might have been given by individual bishops or priests; the same in kind, though of course possessing much greater authority. It is not occupied with deciding any point of controversy which had arisen at the moment; but on the contrary, as even Janus points out (p. 61, note), it goes through the whole body of currently-received Latin dogma. This is done, as Eugenius himself states, "in a certain brief compendium," "under a certain most brief formula." And these very expressions indeed would almost suffice to decide the question before us: because it is undoubtedly "brief" if considered as a catechetical instruction; whereas surely it is the very reverse of brief, if intended as a dogmatic definition. It is for Janus to show cause, why we are to suppose that the Pontiff intended more than he said or hinted; why we are to suppose that he was issuing a lengthy definition of faith, for the purpose of obliging all Catholics to interior assent.

* The impatient reader may omit the following pages on the Decree to the Armenians, without losing any part of our general argument.

However, we have not as yet met Janus's objection. If this Decree really did declare in effect the nullity of contemporary Greek Confirmations and Ordinations,—still more, of course, if it involved the nullity of the same Latin sacraments also—there would be no kind of answer to Janus in merely arguing that the Decree was not strictly *ex cathedrâ*. Even if it were *not ex cathedrâ*, still it would constitute a most formidable objection to the doctrine which we advocate on the authority of Roman tradition. But there is no conclusion on earth more absolutely *certain* on historical grounds, than that the Decree declares nothing of the kind. We cannot express this argument better, than in the words of a former contributor to this Review, whose comment appeared in January 1866, pp. 282—3. He is speaking immediately on the subject of Greek *ordinations*; which had been the particular question raised: but he afterwards applies his remarks to the other sacraments mentioned by Janus. At the time then when this Decree was issued, “the Greek bishops had been eighteen months among the Latins; they had celebrated at their altars; they had administered sacraments; their priestly and episcopal character had never been called in question. Every essential difference was freely and unhesitatingly discussed. It will hardly be alleged that the existence or non-existence of a Christian priesthood throughout the entire East was a secondary question; yet during the entire proceedings of the Council no allusion even is made to any insufficiency in the Greek rite. Even after the Act of Union a conference was held, in which the Greeks were called upon to explain many of their usages; and the questions of the Latins show a minute acquaintance with the peculiarities of the Greek rites: yet no question was raised about the Sacrament of Order.”

Nothing then can be clearer or more certain, than that Eugenius IV., with the whole West, fully believed the validity of Greek ordination. Even if the difficulty were extremely great of so explaining this Decree as to show its consistency with such validity, there would, nevertheless, be absolutely irrefragable historical proof that there *is* no inconsistency. But in fact there is not even any *apparent* inconsistency nor any doctrinal difficulty whatever, if a certain theory be assumed concerning the matter and form of sacraments, which is adopted by many eminent theologians. Our contributor of 1866 proceeded to set forth this theory:—

“There is no question that the matter and form of all the sacraments was instituted by our Lord; and that, whilst the Church has full power to prescribe or to vary such ceremonies and observances as she judges good, according to time, place, and circumstances, yet she can only do so, ‘*salvâ eorum substantiâ*.’ It is, however, the opinion of a very large number of theologians,

that this determination of the matter and form of the sacraments by our Lord was not in the same way or degree for all of them. In Baptism the form admits of more latitude than in the Holy Eucharist; in Extreme Unction than in Baptism. In the Sacrament of Matrimony any form suffices, whether it consists of words or signs, which will serve for a valid contract. According then to this theory,—with regard to the Sacrament of Order, our Lord determined only that the matter should consist of some sensible sign, sufficiently significative of the power conferred; whilst He authorized the Church to determine, whether by decree or by permitted custom, what *in specie* that external sign should be: and of course she might thus vary it according to time and place. This theory is supported by S. Bonaventure, Alexander Alensis, De Lugo, Suarez, Viva, the Salmanticenses, Morinus, Croix Holzmänn, Billuart, Antoine, and many other theologians, and Bellarmine calls it ‘credible.’” We may add that F. Franzelin, than whom there is no higher living authority, shows himself very propense towards this theory (*De Sacramentis*, pp. 44—46). And his whole section is well worth the study of those, who may be perplexed by Janus’s statements.

It had been asked indeed, why no saving clause was added, to state that the Greek rite was valid. Our contributor replied, that “the explanation” of this fact “is very simple. The Pope was not drawing up a complete and exhaustive treatise on the Sacraments. He himself, in the body of the Decree, declares his intention to be ‘ut sub *quodam brevi compendio*, orthodoxæ fidei veritatem traderemus;’ and again, ‘*Ecclesiasticorum sacramentorum veritatem . . . sub hac brevissimâ redigimus formulâ.*’ It was hardly to be expected that a ‘*brevissima formula*’ of instruction, and that, too, published for a special occasion and for a practical end—namely, the union of the Armenians with the Latin Church, and their instruction in the rite they were going to adopt,—should enter into the specialities of the Greek Euchologia, which were nothing to the purpose in hand.”

The Decree therefore, on which Janus lays such singular stress, did not at all imply the invalidity, in certain other countries and other times, of sacraments ministered with matter and form more or less different from those laid down in the Decree. It was entirely occupied, so far as regarded the sacraments, with explaining the matter and form which were sanctioned for those who, like the Armenians addressed, were to receive the Latin rite. Moreover, for those who think that it was not *ex cathedrâ*, there is no difficulty in admitting, that in this or that particular it may have contained some incidental and subordinate mistake.

In a note Janus complains, that “Denzinger, in order to conceal the purely dogmatic character of this Decree, has omitted the first

part on the Trinity and Incarnation." What a singular complaint! Denzinger expressly says that the Decree contains the Nicene Symbol, the Definition of Chalcedon, &c. &c.: only he does not occupy space in printing them all off again, because he has printed them already.

But if Janus is perplexing, his translator is unintelligible. "The same conspicuously untenable explanation" he says "was adopted in the DUBLIN REVIEW for January 1866." *What* explanation? Janus had not spoken of any *explanation* as given by Denzinger, but of his supposed attempt at concealment. Our contributor no doubt did give an explanation of the Decree, as the reader has seen; and if Janus's translator thinks that explanation "conspicuously untenable," by all means let him express reasons for the opinion.

This well-discussed Decree is that Papal pronouncement, on which Janus speaks most triumphantly: that on which he descants at the *greatest length*, is Nicholas III.'s "*Exiit*," taken in connection with John XXII.'s "*Cum inter nonnullos*" (pp. 57—59). But Denzinger, with whom Janus shows himself well acquainted, refers his readers (n. 419) to Natalis Alexander, as having sufficiently explained the perfect harmony of these two pronouncements; nor has Janus attempted any reply to that historian. The matter is also treated in Dr. Ward's "*Brief Summary*," appended to our number of July 1868, pp. 24—26. He ventures however in one respect so far to differ from Natalis Alexander, as to think that the "*Exiit*" does contain an *ex cathedrâ* determination.

The most formidable-looking of all Janus's citations is Paul IV.'s Bull "*Cum ex Apostolatus officio*," (p. 382); nor, indeed, do we at all deny that that Bull requires very careful consideration, though on totally different grounds from those alleged by Janus. But as far as *he* is concerned, never was there a simpler case. There is literally no pretext for thinking that this Bull was dogmatic in any sense whatever: the only dogmatic statement which Janus quotes—that which he numbers "(1)"—so far from being *defined* in the Bull, comes in quite accidentally and parenthetically. The same thing may be said even more strongly of the well-known "*In Cœnâ Domini*": concerning which Janus has the effrontery to say (p. 385), that "if ever any document bore the stamp of an *ex cathedrâ* decision, it is this."

We will now therefore pass from Janus's first class of arguments to his second; from his objections founded on alleged Papal errors, to those founded on a broad view of history. These will be found to be three in number, and shall be treated successively. First of all he speaks as follows.

For thirteen centuries an incomprehensible silence on this fundamental article reigned throughout the whole Church and her literature. None of the ancient confessions of faith, no catechism, none of the patristic writings com-

posed for the instruction of the people, contain a syllable about the Pope ; still less any hint that all certainty of faith and doctrine depends on him " (p. 64).

Now, since Janus believes after a fashion in *the Church's* infallibility,—if this passage means anything at all, it must mean that in the first thirteen centuries "confessions of faith," "catechisms," "writings for the instruction of the people," dwelt prominently and explicitly on the infallibility of certain *Councils*, or of the Christian *people*, but were mysteriously silent on the infallibility of the *Pope*. But can he really mean to maintain this paradox? Will he even allege, that the word "infallibility," or any other word precisely equivalent, was in use *at all*? He will perhaps reply that various phrases circulated through the Church, which substantially *involve* that doctrine:—"securus judicat orbis terrarum"; "quod semper quod ubique quod ab omnibus"; &c. &c. But then other phrases also were as widely prevalent, which quite as clearly involve *Pontifical* infallibility: as, e.g., "Fides Petri non deficit in successoribus suis"; or "Petrus vivit et judicat in successoribus suis"; or "ad Romæ Cathedram perfidia non habet accessum." It may be urged again with great truth, that one plain Rule of Faith was given to all Christians from the first; viz., unreserved acceptance of the full doctrine taught in the Apostolic churches: but then it must *also* be remembered, that *among* these churches Rome possessed the "potentior principalitas." At all events let Janus quote, if he can, some of those "confessions of faith," "catechisms," "patristic writings composed for the instruction of the people,"—which speak indeed explicitly about the *Church's* infallibility and our dependence thereon for "all certainty of faith and doctrine,"—but which nevertheless contain no "syllable" about the *Pope*. Our own view of facts is very different. The dogma of the Church's infallibility, like so many others, was practically taught and enforced by the *Ecclesia Docens*—was firmly held and acted on by the *Ecclesia Credens*—long before it was systematically contemplated and formulized.

To a Catholic indeed, as we shall immediately urge, this paucity of formulized statements presents no difficulty whatever: but it is simply fatal to *Janus*. Consider his position. He places infallibility, as has been seen, in the body of the faithful; in the "*sensus fidelium*." Now of course he admits that, while the Apostles lived, infallibility resided with *them*. On his view therefore, the Apostles taught that, after their death, the Church's constitution would undergo the most fundamental of revolutions; and that thenceforward, instead of pastors infallibly teaching the flock, the flock were infallibly to distinguish between the true and false doctrines taught by their pastors. Now on the *Catholic* supposition—viz., that to the *Ecclesia Docens* of every subsequent age the same intellectual sub-

mission has been due as to the Apostles themselves—nothing is more easily intelligible, than the comparative absence of formulized statements on the subject in early times : because everything was proceeding, as a matter of course, on the very basis established by the Apostles. But if (as Janus must think) a fundamental *revolution* in the Rule of Faith took place by the Apostles' command at the Apostles' death, it is absolutely impossible that this profound silence can have reigned. Never, we say, was there a more monstrous proposition than Janus's: viz., that on the Apostles' death the most violent revolution ensued as to a Christian's Rule of Faith, and yet that no one historical record remains giving the slightest *hint* of such a revolution. Yet even this is greatly to understate our argument. History is *not* silent on Janus's hypothesis, but directly contradicts it : every extant record which bears on the subject shows that, after the Apostles' death no less than during their life, it was to the Church's *rulers* that the people unreservedly looked for secure and faithful guidance. Janus indeed presents an almost incredible instance of what we must call controversial effrontery. While himself advocating the most wildly unhistorical of theories, he has the nerve to assail the dogma of Pontifical infallibility, on the ground of deficiency in historical evidence.

We must resume however our argument. No historical fact, we have said, is more certain, than that the Ecclesia Docens of subsequent times succeeded to Apostolic infallibility. But the bishops are not *individually* infallible : and when you say therefore that God has endowed the Catholic Episcopate with infallibility, you have said nothing definite, until you further explain *how* the said Episcopate is to put out its voice. You must explain whether you mean that God has vested this gift in the *majority* of bishops *assembled at a Council* ; or in the *majority* of bishops *dispersed throughout the world* ; or, in fact, what you do consider the divinely appointed method of infallible episcopal teaching. Ultramontanes maintain, that the Episcopate teaches infallibly then, and then only, when it teaches in union with its visible *Head* ; consequently that the Holy See is itself the one ultimate seat of infallibility. And for this view there is indubitably much producible historical authority. What Ultramontanes further allege—what we have repeatedly argued in detail on former occasions—is that there is no other view of the subject whatever,—which on the one hand admits of being wrought into any intelligible or consistent theory,—and in behalf of which, on the other hand, one single definite testimony can be produced, from the whole thirteen centuries to which Janus appeals.

No one, we say, can possibly deny, that Ultramontanes do bring forward a considerable array of historical sanctions for their

doctrine. We are pressed for space indeed, and might content ourselves with a reference to the rich repository of facts brought together by the Archbishop : pp. 70—78. Still we will ourselves also instance three well-known specimens of a large number. Thus (1) S. Celestine, A.D. 431, in sending his legates to the Council of Ephesus for the anathematization of Nestorius, tells them that *they* are to *judge* on the opinions of the bishops, not to *enter into dispute* with them : and accordingly he announces to the Council, that he has sent legates to carry out what *he has already determined*. Philip, one of these legates, says publicly to the assembled bishops—and they all give tacit assent to the declaration—that S. Peter “was the foundation of the Catholic Church ; and that *to this time and always* he lives and exercises judgment in the person of his successors.” Finally the bishops anathematize Nestorius, “compelled thereto,” as they expressly say (*ἀναγκαστὸς κατεπέλχθεντες*), “by the sacred canons, and *the Letter* of our most holy *father* and fellow-minister Celestine.” Then (2) the repentant Acacians of the East, A.D. 519, address a formula to Pope S. Hormisdas, in which they distinctly say that those “who do not *think with the Apostolic See*” are “*severed from the communion of the Catholic Church.*” Moreover this same profession of faith was not only subscribed at the time by all the bishops of the East, but long afterwards by the Fathers, both Latin and Greek, of the Eighth Ecumenical Council. And (3) Pope S. Agatho, A.D. 680, in his Letter to the Sixth Council, uses these most remarkable words, without meeting any kind of protest from the assembled bishops. “The Lord and Saviour of all Who *promised that the faith of Peter should not fail*, admonished him to *confirm his brethren* : and it is known to all that the Apostolic Pontiffs my predecessors have always done this energetically.” According to S. Agatho then, (α) the promise made to S. Peter was made also to his successors in the Roman See ; (β) that promise was of *infallibility*, that “his faith fail not” ; and (γ) that promise was given, in order that *in every age* the Roman Pontiff might exercise the office, thus peculiar to himself, of *confirming his brethren in orthodox doctrine*. In all these cases it is remarkable, not merely that the Pontiff puts forth so peremptory a claim, but that the Eastern bishops (tacitly or expressly) accept it. This fact, we admit, is by no means sufficient to demonstrate, that they saw clearly all which is involved in the Pontifical declaration ; but it does irrefragably prove the very important conclusion, that no *other* and *contradictory* theory had possession of their mind. And it is by no means unimportant *ad hominem* further to point out, that all our instances have been taken from those first eight centuries, during which Janus

considers the Primacy to have assumed no more than its legitimate development. Well may we be amazed, with the Archbishop (p. 93, note), at Janus's incredible statement.

Our reply to him then is briefly this. No historical fact can be more certain, than that the post-Apostolic Ecclesia Docens received from the Apostles the prerogative and duty of infallibly teaching the flock. But by absolute necessity this infallibility was vested, either in the bishops as acting in union with the Holy See, or else in the bishops as acting under some *other* definite organization which admits of being named. Now there is a very considerable amount of evidence from the first which tells for the former alternative, while there is no particle or scintilla of evidence which tells for any other. Hence the dogma of Pontifical Infallibility is that really revealed by Christ to the Apostles. Undoubtedly, as time went on and heterogeneous circumstances occurred, Catholics came to see, far more clearly than at first, how much is *involved* in their doctrine, as to the especial office of the Holy See in preserving unity of faith throughout the Church. Moreover, as was to be expected from their function, Popes were far more clear-sighted than others on this point; and had on that account often to encounter energetic resistance, even from well-intentioned Catholics. But if Janus, or any one else, alleges that any other *doctrine* except the Roman existed at any time or in any portion of the Catholic Church for the first "thirteen centuries," let him express what that doctrine *is*, and *where* and *when* it prevailed. No one in fact can possibly do anything of the kind. As to Janus, we need not say, that *he* has done nothing of the kind; because it is his peculiar ignominy to have written a volume so exclusively negative and destructive.

Archbishop Manning's remarks on the historical argument are most important, and point to a view of the case which is too often overlooked. He cites the Immaculate Conception, as illustrating Pontifical infallibility in regard to the kind of historical testimony on which either dogma rests. He then proceeds:—

The doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, though not as yet defined, is everywhere declared in the whole history of Christianity. It has likewise its distinct periods, steadily advancing to a definition. But it will be seen that the infallibility of the visible Head of the Church is intrinsically necessary to the infallibility of the Church. The same periods of simple belief, of analysis, and of definition may be traced. The first, in which the belief of the infallibility of the Church and of the Pontiff pervaded all the world, both East and West. This belief was not only professed, but reduced to practice in the public action of the Church; and in every public and authoritative instance on record *the infallibility of the Church is declared to rest upon the stability in faith of the Roman Church, or of the See of Peter, or of the Apostolic See, or of the Successor of the Apostle, or of the Voice of Peter,*

still teaching by his Successor in his See. The "praxis" of the Church—that is, its immemorial, universal, and invariable procedure in the declaration of faith and the condemnation of error—implies and demands always as its motive the stability in faith of the Roman See, and in almost all cases explicitly declares it. This period extends from the beginning to the time immediately preceding the Council of Constance. The second period is, as before, one of contention and analysis, in which Occam, John of Paris, Marsilius of Padua, Nicholas de Clemangis, Gerson, Peter d'Ailly, and others of less note, began to distinguish and to deny what had till then been always implicitly or explicitly believed.

The third period may be said to begin from 1682, in which the denial of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff was first enunciated in a formula. It opened the period of definition. The contests between those who maintained the Immaculate Nativity and those who maintained the Immaculate Conception led to a closer and more scientific analysis, from which two things have resulted: first, the elimination of the doctrine of the Immaculate Nativity as inadequate and erroneous; and secondly, the definition of the Immaculate Conception. So, also, the contests between those who maintain the infallibility of the Church, but reject the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, have already resulted in an analysis of the whole subject of the divine certainty of faith, and the divine order by which the faith is preserved and propounded in the world; and from this will likewise follow in due time—whether now or hereafter it is not for us to say—two consequences: first, the elimination of the doctrine of 1682 as inadequate and erroneous; and secondly, a definition of the Infallibility of the Church, embodied in its immemorial and universal *praxis*, of which the stability of the faith of Peter, both in his See and in his Successor, is the primary and necessary condition (pp. 63–66).

So much on Janus's first general objection. He immediately however follows it up by a second:—

The Roman bishops took no part in the commotions which the numerous Gnostic sects, the Montanists and Chiliasts, produced in the early Church; nor can a single dogmatic decree issued by one of them be found during the first four centuries, nor a trace of the existence of any. Even the controversy about Christ kindled by Paul of Samosata, which occupied the whole Eastern Church for a long time, and necessitated the assembling of several Councils, was terminated without the Pope taking any part in it. So again in the chain of controversies and discussions connected with the names of Theodotus, Artemon, Noetus, Sabellius, Beryllus, and Lucian of Antioch, which troubled the whole Church, and extended over nearly 150 years, there is no proof that the Roman bishops acted beyond the limits of their own local Church, or accomplished any dogmatic result. The only exception is the dogmatic treatise of the Roman bishop Dionysius, following a Synod held at Rome in 262, denouncing and rejecting Sabellianism and the opposite method of expression of Dionysius of Alexandria. This document, if any authority had been ascribed to it, was well fitted in itself to cut short, or

rather strangle in its birth, the long Arian disturbance ; but it was not known out of Alexandria, and exercised no influence whatever on the later course of the controversy (pp. 64-5).

It has never been our lot to read a more astonishing collection of statements, than is here brought together.* We could hardly believe our eyes, when we read that "the Roman bishops *took no part* in the commotions which the numerous Gnostic sects, the Montanists and Chiliasts, produced in the early Church, nor can a single dogmatic decree issued by one of them be found during the first four centuries, nor a trace of the existence of any." Most wonderful ! Was he ignorant, or did he think that we were ignorant, of the fact, that the Gnostics Valentinus and Cerdo were a long time in Rome, and that the former at least was formally excommunicated, while the latter was convicted of heresy ? Had he forgotten, or did he never know, that Marcion repaired to Rome to obtain a reversal of a sentence pronounced against him, and, having failed in his object, there established the head-quarters of his sect ? Is it or is it not true that "the Montanists from Phrygia came to Rome to obtain the countenance of its bishop" ? † The fact of the matter is, that during the three first centuries almost all the contests of the Church were fought within the walls of Rome, because heretics all but universally went thither to experiment on the chance of obtaining a decision in their favour. And this is the pretext for the audacious equivocation, by which the author asserts that "there is no proof that the Roman bishops acted beyond the limits of their own local Church." The author might as well assert that Pius IX. has no influence beyond his local Church, because he affixes his Bulls to the gates of S. Mary Major, and does not send them round by the penny post. The fact is, that almost all of the names in Janus's remarkable sentence are those of men who, either themselves or their disciples, lived in Rome, and were actually condemned at Rome. Theodotus fled to Rome and was excommunicated by S. Victor. The school of Noetus was represented at Rome by Cleomenes, who was there expelled from the Church. Sabellius was opposed at Rome by S. Callistus. Gnostics, Ebionites, Patripassians, Sabellians, all were condemned at Rome.

Janus adds that the Roman bishops "accomplished no dogmatic results." Most marvellous ! Did Janus laugh in his sleeve when he wrote those words, or had he never read the "Philosophumena" of Hippolytus ? For a commentary on that vivid picture of the state of the Roman Church in the third century we

* Our readers will see at once, that a few following paragraphs were not furnished by the contributor who wrote the rest of our article.

† Newman, *Development*, p. 22.

appeal, not to Hagemann's excellent book on its early history, but to Dr. Döllinger's masterly analysis. After that, Milman's assertion, of which Janus is the echo, that the Roman Church had no doctrinal influence in the first centuries, ought long ago to have been reckoned among the myths of a time when historical science had not progressed beyond Rollin and Prideaux. So far from having accomplished no dogmatic result, Callistus, the freed slave of a Greek banker, anticipated doctrinal results, which only became common more than a hundred years afterwards. Let us listen to Dr. Döllinger. Speaking of some words of S. Callistus, Dr. Döllinger says, "This representation of the reciprocal inhabitation (*περιχώρησις*) of the divine Persons, which the Fathers of the Church have carefully worked out (*ausgebildet haben*) since Arian times, is much to be remarked in Callistus" (p. 239). Then, on the Incarnation: Callistus "placed both the Father and the Logos in a close relation: even with respect to the *οἰκονομία* he was led to the same result, which the later Fathers afterwards evolved more accurately" (p. 241). Is it or is it not a simple fact that this, till a few years ago all but unknown, Pope condemned at once Sabellius and Hippolytus? * It has fallen to the lot of few Sovereign Pontiffs to pronounce doctrinal decisions on two such heresies, as full-blown Sabellianism and Arianism in the bud. When we remember that Patripassianism, Sabellianism proper, and the philosophical Logos of Hippolytus were all striving in Rome together, —and all condemned by successive Popes,—we fearlessly assert, not only that there was as much intellectual activity within its walls in the third century as there is now in all Germany in the nineteenth, but that the Popes watched it as closely as Pius IX. has watched Gunther and Froschammer in our day. As for the view that the result was "local," it is simply a wretched subterfuge to escape from facts, itself disproved by facts. Again we appeal to Dr. Döllinger. "That the greater part of the churches proceeded to acknowledge Callistus is not to be doubted, and it seems to me that Hippolytus himself says it" (p. 230).

It is impossible to deny, we say, that in those ante-Nicene times the eyes of Christendom were fixed on Rome, and took from her the norm of doctrine. All heretics and teachers of false doctrine of any kind flocked to Rome for approval, and rebelled when they were condemned, precisely as they do now. The key and the interpretation to the whole facts of ecclesiastical history of the first ages is simply this: Rome, perfectly conscious of, what we should now call, her own infallibility, condemns all false doctrine, right and left; Quartodecimans in Asia, S. Cyprian in Africa, a patriarch in Alexandria. But, Janus would probably say, all

* Döllinger, Hippolytus und Kallistus, pp. 230–232.

these resisted. Of course some resisted, for such is human nature. But there is this most notable circumstance, never to be forgotten ; they were always wrong, and the Pope was always right : not once, but always. In all the great controversies of the primitive church, those about Easter, the Baptism of heretics, and the penitential discipline, we at this day are living on the doctrinal victory of Rome. What becomes now of the assertion of Janus, that the Popes were unable to carry out their own views ? For a time men rebelled : but the Popes were right, and the Church came to see that they were right ; and that what they merely tolerated, as they tolerate Gallicanism now, was wrong. All the men of talent of the Church, all the men of science and progress, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen,* were condemned, as a philosophical German might be now. The growls of Tertullian over a decree of Pope Zephyrinus, and his ironical contempt for the title of Bishop of Bishops, are at once a proof that the voice of the Sovereign Pontiff reached beyond the limits of his own local Church, and that the flippant contemptuousness of Janus has not even the merit of originality.

We say *some* resisted. If, however, the legend of Prudentius represents any truth, Hippolytus submitted before he died. Above all, if S. Dionysius did not retract in the same formal terms as men would do now, even the fragments of his letter prove the enormous influence of the condemnation of the Pope on his doctrinal expressions. What can Janus possibly mean by his assertion, that the Letter of S. Dionysius of Rome exercised no influence whatever on the later course of the controversy ? One might almost say, on the contrary, that it was the one human means, whereby the controversy issued throughout the Church in the Nicene definition. The Pontiff's Letter simply determined the teaching of Alexandria in favour of the Homoousion ; and to the teaching of Alexandria the Church owes Athanasius.†

At last however, there is so much obscurity in various details of the ante-Nicene era, and again there were so many circumstances which impeded free communion between Pope and bishops, that one can in some sense understand a violently prejudiced and angry controversialist not understanding what was then the real position of the Holy See. But Janus actually uses similar language in regard to the post-Nicene centuries. He says gravely (p. 478) that "for the first thousand years no Pope ever issued a doctrinal decision intended for and addressed to the whole Church." Again (p. 407), "no single decree of a Pope addressed to the whole Church is known for the first thousand years of Christian history." He adds

* As Dr. Döllinger thinks by a separate synod under Pontian, 259.

† As to the dogmatic work done at Rome in ante-Nicene times, see our number for April, 1868, pp. 337-339 ; and for last January, pp. 66-68.

that Boniface VIII.'s Bull "Unam Sanctam," in 1303, is "the first addressed to the whole Church."

Now what can be intended by this last sentence? The "Unam Sanctam" is not *formally* addressed to the whole Church, but is headed "in perpetuam rei memoriam." Janus then must actually mean, that this Bull was the first doctrinal pronouncement, ever issued by a Pontiff with an intention of teaching the whole Church obligatory doctrine. Incredible! We are sure no such statement was ever made before by Catholic, Protestant, or Infidel.* As we have been obliged for room's sake to make a selection out of his topics, we have reserved no space for duly replying to such an allegation as this. To refute it would be simply (one may say) to reprint the whole treatises of Orsi and Muzzarelli.† We will cite but two instances: and firstly we will adduce the profession of faith exacted by S. Hormisdas of the Eastern bishops as a condition of communion, from which we have already given an extract. That profession begins with stating that "to preserve the rule of right faith is the commencement of salvation"; and that, in accordance with Christ's "Tu es Petrus," "religion has ever been preserved without defilement in the Apostolic See." "Wherefore," it presently continues, "we *receive and approve all the Letters of Pope Leo* concerning the Christian religion"; . . . "following in all things the Apostolic See, and *preaching all her Constitutions.*" It is very certain therefore, that these "Letters of Pope Leo" and "Constitutions of the Holy See" claimed assent from the whole Church. Then turn from this to a Letter of Pope Vigilius's to the Greek Emperor, which Orsi gives at length. After having recited various Letters of his predecessors, S. Leo, S. Hormisdas, S. Agapetus, which had never been placed before any Œcumenical Council, the Pope thus proceeds:—

With regard then to those things which have been defined concerning the Faith by the Fathers of the *four holy Synods*, and by the before-mentioned *Letters of Pope Leo of happy memory* and the *Constitutions of our venerable predecessors*—condemning, by the authority of the Apostolic See, those who do not follow these in every particular (*per omnia non sequentes*), and who

* Yet since this article was first in type, something not dissimilar has been alleged by Mr. Renouf. See our notice of his new pamphlet in our present number.

† "Tota mea argumentatio fundatur in duobus factis historicis, quæ proculdubio *extra omnem controversiam posita sunt*. . . . Primum factum constat ex historiâ ecclesiasticâ usque ab antiquissimâ ætate quod Romani Pontifices sapius. . . . libellos et professiones fidei *a singulis episcopis subscribendas indixerunt*, vel decreta et constitutiones de Fide ediderunt *per universam Ecclesiam cum præcepto obediendi* ad omnes episcopos directo." — Muzzarelli, de Auctoritate Summi Pontificis, c. xii. sec. 4.

oppose their doctrines,—we *anathematize* those who shall have attempted either perversely to dispute or *faithlessly to doubt* concerning the exposition or *rectitude of that Faith*; and we *sever from the unity of the Catholic Faith* persons, who think against those things concerning the Faith which are contained in the *most holy Synods* of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and in the above-mentioned *Letters of our predecessor Leo* of happy memory, or all those things which his authority sanctioned (lib. i., c. 19, art. 2).

Here then are various Letters and Constitutions of various Popes, which a Pope places on precisely the same level with the definitions of an Œcumenical Council; anathematizing all those, who will not humbly submit to them “in all things.” At one stroke of the pen, so to speak, he holds up both the Letter he is now writing and the various Letters of his predecessors there recited, as obliging the interior assent of all Catholics under the penalty of an anathema. But in real truth, through the whole post-Nicene period, Pontifical dogmatic Letters issued *ex cathedrâ* are no less undeniable and no less obtrusive matters of historical fact, than are Œcumenical Councils themselves: they meet the student at every page.

We should ourselves maintain of course, that during this whole period these Apostolic Letters played a far more important part than Councils themselves in preserving purity of faith. But the Gallican controversy is not to our purpose, when arguing against so simply anti-Catholic a writer as Janus.

As to the work before us, we have confined our remarks to one particular subject, because in no other way could we hope to arrive at any effective result. Of its general drift we will only say, that nothing can be feebler or more irrelevant than its reiterated complaints about literary *forgery*. The simple question is, whether, in any given period of the Church’s history, Popes were contending for any higher position than was theirs by divine appointment. Catholic writers have again and again assigned reasons for giving a *negative* answer to this question, and Janus leaves those reasons untouched. But, as F. Ryder has excellently pointed out in his “Critique,” in an uncritical age it will be constantly happening, that where some spurious document is perfectly orthodox in doctrine, neither a Pope nor any one else has the slightest ground for doubting its genuineness. Indeed, Janus’s argument may be retorted against himself. For the more you dwell on the ease with which these spurious documents obtained credence, the more singularly remarkable becomes the fact, that no Pope has ever been led by any such forgery to assume any prerogative, which cannot be satisfactorily defended by genuine testimonies.

We have not troubled ourselves with the question of Janus’s

personal history. We will only say, in agreement with the "Month," that we find it very difficult to suppose that so indubitably and extensively learned a man as Dr. Döllinger can be mixed up with so poor and feeble a production. But an English Catholic is more concerned with Janus's English translator and approvers. And certainly, if we desired a strong defence for that particular in our public conduct which has been most vehemently assailed, we should rejoice in the attendant circumstances of this case. We have always maintained, that there is an organized, though small, band of professing Catholics in England, who are as truly enemies to the Church as avowed Protestants can be; and who are immeasurably more dangerous than avowed Protestants, from the very fact that Catholics in general are not duly on their guard against them. The one member of this party whom we have been most often obliged to name, is Mr. Oxenham. What is that gentleman's present position? He comes before the public as sponsor for a work, which openly denies the Church's corporate unity, and counts Anglicans and Photians as her members. There are probably indeed not five *soi-disant* Catholics in England who would go the whole way with him in whitewashing Janus. But there are many more than five, who are more or less leavened with the same spirit; and those few unhappy Catholic parents, who send their sons to Oxford, do all they possibly can towards diffusing the poison more widely. Such facts as the Coblenz address, says the Archbishop,—

Prove that in the Catholic Church there is a school at variance with the doctrinal teaching of the Holy See in matters which are not of faith. But they do not reveal how small that school is. Its centre would seem to be at Munich; it has, both in France and in England, a small number of adherents. They are active, they correspond, and, for the most part, write anonymously. It would be difficult to describe its tenets, for none of its followers seem to be agreed in all points. Some hold the infallibility of the Pope, and some defend the Temporal Power. Nothing appears to be common to all, except an animus of opposition to the acts of the Holy See in matters outside the Faith.

In this country, about a year ago, an attempt was made to render impossible, as it was confidently but vainly thought, the definition of the infallibility of the Pontiff, by reviving the monotonous controversy about Pope Honorius. Later we were told of I know not what combination of exalted personages in France for the same end. It is certain that these symptoms are not sporadic and disconnected, but in mutual understanding and with a common purpose. The anti-Catholic press has eagerly encouraged this school of thought. If a Catholic can be found out of tune with authority by half a note, he is at once extolled for unequalled learning and irrefragable logic. The anti-Catholic journals are at his service, and he vents his opposition to the common opinions of the Church by writing against them anonymously (p. 32).

In regard then to Janus and his approvers, we have maintained that they are no more Catholics in their belief than are Dean Stanley and Professor Jowett. They deny the Church's corporate unity, and they deny the infallibility of the Church in communion with Rome. We need hardly say that the change is most violent, from such thinkers as these, to the three French writers whom we have named at the head of our article. These hold most firmly, as of faith, that every *ex cathedrâ* utterance of the Supreme Pontiff is infallible, when tacitly accepted by the bishops of his communion. And their general tone also towards the Holy See and the Church, whatever else may be said of it, stands out in broadest opposition to that of Janus. Nevertheless, as it seems to us, they aim at so fundamental and revolutionary a change in the Church's practical organization, that it is important to place their view distinctly before our readers.

Mgr. Dupanloup is of course immeasurably the most weighty of the three, because of his great and most justly deserved influence over Catholics throughout the world. We make no apology for criticising his work with perfect freedom, though (we trust) with all the respect due to so illustrious a person. Mgr. Dupanloup himself both communicated it to the newspapers and has circulated it also as a pamphlet, with an avowed view of influencing Catholic opinion in every country; and it cannot be taken therefore as merely a pastoral address to his clergy, but rather as a literary and controversial production offered to the free criticism of its readers. We are rather curious, indeed, to know the origin of its publication. On the 10th of November Mgr. Dupanloup issued "a letter to the clergy and faithful of his diocese before his departure for Rome," which breathes peace in every line; and which ends by expressing by anticipation the bishop's hearty and unreserved adherence to all decisions of the Vatican Council, whether conformable or otherwise to his own previous judgment. The letter now before us is dated the very next day, November 11th; and is certainly conceived in a most different spirit. It is apparently written under intense excitement, in some parts even displaying a certain acrimony and bitterness: and, though purporting to deal exclusively with the question of *opportuneness*, it can hardly (we think) have been even *intended* to conceal his own dissent from the Ultramontane *doctrine*. Indeed, he seems to have been surprised at any one venturing to *hold* that doctrine: for in three different places (pp. 9, 50, 52) he quotes Archbishop Manning's statement that a Pope can define dogmata apart from the Episcopate; and each time he prints these four last words in capitals, as if to express his extreme surprise at the opinion.* We have been more amazed than we can well express

* After writing the passage in the text, we observed the subjoined observations in the "Tablet":—

that so experienced a writer can have put forth a manifesto which is argumentatively so feeble. And though we have no space to criticise it in any detail, yet, before proceeding further with our general argument, we will briefly animadvert on one or two of Mgr. Dupanloup's remarks. We will take these in the order in which they occur.

1. In p. 7 the author implies that no Catholic, unversed in theological studies, can have reasonable ground for firmly holding the Ultramontane doctrine. This language—*mutatis mutandis*—somewhat reminds us of a ground not unfrequently taken up by Anglicans; viz., that no Anglican can with a safe conscience submit himself to the Catholic Church, until he has studied the great Anglican theologians and is able to refute them. But Mgr. Dupanloup must admit it to be *imaginable*—to our mind it is *certain*—that the Church has in various unmistakable ways implied the Ultramontane as being her true doctrine, though she does not actually enforce that doctrine as *of faith*. Now, if this be so, then surely Catholic laymen, of average intelligence and education, are fully competent to recognize the fact.

2. In p. 29 the author dwells on the circumstance, that certain Popes have “formulated if not defined” certain doctrines concerning the Church's power in temporals. His chief instance, of course, is the Bull “*Unam sanctam*.” But Suarez (de Fide, s. 3, n. 22) speaks of it as “manifest,” that the “*Unam sanctam*” “has been received and approved by the common consent of the Catholic Church.” There is Suarez's distinct testimony therefore, that bishops as well as Popes have accepted this Bull as dogmatic; and moreover, it was confirmed by Leo X. in *Œcumenical Council*: consequently Gallicans are as much concerned to defend it as Ultramontanes can possibly be. To the same effect those Munich theologians who answered Prince Hohenlohe's questions in a sense

“The readers of Mgr. Dupanloup's ‘Observations’ will be struck with the great stress he has laid on the phrase ‘*indépendamment et séparément des évêques*,’ which he dresses up in capital letters and inverted commas, repeats in some five different parts of his pamphlet, and ascribes to the Archbishop of Westminster. We could not at first make out what was his particular objection to the words; but we think we have now discovered his meaning. The word ‘*séparément*’ might convey to the French mind—and very likely has conveyed to Mgr. Dupanloup's—a sense essentially different from any involved in the original expression ‘*apart from*.’ The French word might convey the notion that the Archbishop contemplates as possible a doctrinal *separation* between Pope and bishops; that he contemplates the possibility of some Pope putting forth a doctrinal decree from which the body of the Episcopate shall dissent. But the English original could not possibly be understood in any such sense; and the Archbishop undoubtedly holds, as all Catholics hold, that God infallibly secures doctrinal union between the Episcopate and its Visible Head.” The Bishop, however, has now denied all intention of fastening such a sense on the Archbishop's words.

opposed to Dr. Döllinger, point out that "whatever since Gregory VII. several Popes have uttered and decreed in this respect, that also several councils, which were and are considered Ecumenical, have uttered and decreed in like manner." They quote the Third and Fourth Lateran, and the first of Lyons, as sanctioning the deposition of kings by the Church; they add that the assemblies of Constance and of Basle threatened emperors, kings, &c., with loss of their office for certain cases of disobedience; and that even the Council of Trent (Sess. xxv, de Reform., c. 19) imposed the loss of certain temporal dominions, as a punishment for allowing any place to be used for duelling between Christians. These theologians think indeed that, notwithstanding these decrees, the doctrine in question does not bind the interior assent of Catholics; and on this we are not here expressing any opinion. We only point out, that no definition of Pontifical infallibility could introduce any fresh difficulty whatever on this particular subject.

3. "Bellarmino was placed on the Index, for not having maintained the *direct* power of the Pope over" monarchs: though he did maintain most strongly the *indirect* (p. 31, note). We wish the Bishop had given his authority for this statement, which we never heard of before.

4. He shows curious puzzle-headedness, in the stress which he lays (pp. 34-40) on the difficulty of determining what Pontifical Acts are *ex cathedrâ*. He admits it to be the Church's undoubted doctrine at this moment, that every *ex cathedrâ* Act, issued by the Pope, is known to be infallible, so soon as it becomes apparent that bishops put forth no protest: while, of course, he claims no infallibility whatever for Acts, which were not issued *ex cathedrâ* at all. Whatever difficulties therefore there may be in knowing whether any given Act is *ex cathedrâ*, must generate quite as much practical inconvenience *now*, as could possibly exist under *any* definition of Pontifical infallibility. On the other hand, so far as such definition should pronounce distinctly on the tests of an *ex cathedrâ* Act, in that proportion practical difficulties on the subject would be reduced or would disappear.

5. The author mentions (p. 36) an opinion recently expressed, that a Pontifical Act may be *ex cathedrâ*, which is addressed *formally* to an individual, and which does not expressly state the Pope's intention of binding thereby the interior assent of Catholics. Mgr. Dupanloup thinks that this is a doctrine unknown to standard Ultramontane theologians. But, as we have again and again pointed out, *S. Leo's Letter to S. Flavian* does not in any way state that S. Leo issued it as binding the assent of Catholics. Yet Orsi, Ballerini, Muzzarelli, Cappellari,—indeed, every Ultramontane

theologian we know, except only Bellarmine,—assume as indubitable that this Letter was issued *ex cathedrâ*. The same opinion has quite recently been expressed by F. Matignon, in a reply to Mgr. Maret in the “*Études*.” Certainly, if ever there was a *moderate* Ultramontane theologian, it is F. Matignon.*

6. The Bishop chooses out of “all history” (p. 43), as an objection against Papal infallibility, the case of Paschal II. Yet in the very next page he admits the fact, obvious on the very surface, that that Pontiff’s error of conduct involved no *ex cathedrâ* determination whatever.

7. “A doctrinal judgment is at bottom nothing more than the attestation of a revealed fact” (p. 52). These words were written doubtless without full consideration. For on the surface they would be understood as implying, that the Church is only infallible as “*testis*,” and not also as “*judex*” and “*magistra*”: or, in other words, that she is not infallible in declaring dogmatic facts; or in condemning errors which are *injurious*, without being *contradictory*, to the Deposit; or in proclaiming the moral necessity of the Pope’s civil principedom; &c. &c.

Our readers, we are sure, will not ascribe these brief comments to any want of deference for the illustrious writer’s exalted position, or to any deficiency in that profound respect and gratitude which are due for his unwearying services in the Church’s behalf. But he has on this occasion come before the public as an avowed opponent to the Archbishops of Malines and Westminster, and must of course be understood (as *he* understands *them*) to challenge criticism. Mgr. Dechamps, indeed, has put forth a most effective reply, which we heartily recommend to our readers’ study. We have no space however for further remark on the details of the Bishop’s pamphlet; while on the particular point on which our argument leads us to insist, he is in entire sympathy with Mgr. Maret and the “Correspondant.” Mgr. Maret indeed *expresses* that rejection of Ultramontane doctrine, which the other two only (as it seems to us) imply; and we confess that we have hitherto done

* Dr. Ward, by the way, never admitted that he had once expressed “a grave error” on the extent of infallibility; or that he had persisted “obstinately” in any error whatever (p. 39): though Mgr. Dupanloup or any one else has of course every right to arrive, after examination, at the *conclusion* that Dr. Ward so offended.

We have been a little surprised at the Bishop laying so much stress on this particular retraction. Dr. Ward, in deference to the judgment of theologians, made another retraction, which is certainly more important than that to which Mgr. Dupanloup refers. See “*De Infallibilitatis Extensione*,” “*Questio Prima*.” But in his first letter to F. Ryder, Dr. Ward had said: “That I may have made various incidental and minor mistakes in treating so large a question, I take for granted” (p. 27).

little more, as regards reading his work, than glance at it here and there, look through its table of contents, and verify the quotations given from it in the "*Civiltà*." But, on the whole, these three French writers seem in perfect accord.

We have already mentioned their tone of loyalty to the Supreme Pontiff and the Church: but while such writers as Janus continue to protect themselves under the Catholic name, it will always be important to point out, how simply true Catholics accept as of faith the dogma, that the *Ecclesia Docens* is infallible when teaching in union with the Holy See. Thus Mgr. Dupanloup says (p. 46) that "the infallibility of the Church *has always been an article of faith*"; and elsewhere he makes it abundantly clear, that by "the Church" he here means the Episcopate united with its visible Head. In like manner the "Correspondant." "A conciliar decision clothed with Pontifical assent, or a Pontifical proposition corroborated by assent of the Episcopate,—infallibility *is there, or it is nowhere*: the Holy Ghost speaks by that double organ, or He never speaks at all: a Catholic owes them his submission, or he *ceases to merit that name*" (p. 13; see also p. 20). As to Mgr. Maret, this doctrine is involved in the very thesis which he sets himself to maintain.

Yet, distinctly as these writers testify the Church's infallibility in her express pronouncements, we do not think that they at all adequately ponder—though we are confident they would not think of denying—the infallibility of her *magisterium*. Beginning with the "Correspondant," consider the import of such language as the following. Christ "founded," says the writer (pp. 21-2), "a truly *fraternal monarchy*"; but the cessation of councils for the last three hundred years has tended to give the Church "the appearance of one of those centralized empires, in which there is *no one but master and servants*; and in which movement is communicated from summit to extremities, with the *mechanical regularity of an automaton*. Hence the reproach often made against *modern Catholics*, and *not without reason*, that they have *permitted themselves to lose* (*d'avoir laissé perdre*) that respectful *independence* which the ancient churches knew how to unite with submission; so that [in these days] they wait for and solicit in everything *the impulsion of the Holy See*: a kind of practical Ultramontanism, . . . which really presents some of those evils (*torts*) and dangers which are gratuitously ascribed" to the Ultramontanism that is merely doctrinal. In other words, the writer holds that the general body of the Episcopate has so administered the Church for centuries, as most seriously to impair and almost revolutionize her constitution; and that the Episcopate has thus betrayed some of its primary duties, by the very fact of following too unreservedly the desires of the Holy See.

Mgr. Maret's language, to which the "Civiltà" has drawn attention, is even more disrespectful to the Church's magisterium. For instance. "The [approaching] holy Council will give testimonies to all men of its love [towards God], by the most sincere respect for their liberty, their rights, and their legitimate aspirations. The same love will lead the holy Council to make all the concessions to present times, manners, and needs, which are consistent with the inviolable preservation of the Deposit, and with the rigour of immutable principles. . . . Misunderstandings will be cleared up; hearts, made to understand and love each other, will be united; and there will shine on the world the *dawn* [!!!] of that great unity promised by the Man-God." (Preface, pp. xiii, xiv.) "This is not the place to investigate and enumerate the causes, which have prevented Christian civilization from reaching its apogee; nor to indicate those which have caused its decadence. Let us only have the courage to say, that if Christian unity has been rent—if science has chosen to separate itself from faith—if liberty has chosen to reign without religion—a *terrible part* of responsibility for these misfortunes lies upon *the men who have represented in the Christian world unity, faith, and religion.*" (Ib., p. iii.) Christ then, according to Mgr. Maret, promised the Church a certain brilliant unity: this unity however for an indefinite period has been buried in profoundest night; and a terrible part of the calamity is due to the course, universally and traditionally pursued by a long series of Popes and bishops. Now, for the first time during all these later centuries,—such is Mgr. Maret's expectation—bishops will duly respect the "liberty, rights, and legitimate aspirations" of their fellow-men. And accordingly, though it will take a long time to undo the inveterate evils of the past, yet at least a certain faint *dawn* of Christian unity will shine upon the world, through that vigorous reversal of accepted maxims which may be expected from the Vatican Council.

One cannot be surprised then that both these writers wish for a fundamental change in the Church's constitution; and desire that Œcumenical councils be made periodical. "From the moment in which councils shall have become possible," says the "Correspondant" (p. 23), "*they will be always necessary.*" And Mgr. Maret devotes a whole chapter (book v., c. 5) to "the periodicity" of councils; suggesting (vol. ii. p. 396) that ten years is the greatest interval which can be wisely allowed to elapse, between one Œcumenical council and another. All important matters are to be transacted at these councils: in the interval between which the Holy See is only to engage in matters of mere routine, or else in such pressing affairs as admit of no delay. And the writers desire this, not on mere grounds of expediency, but as due to the authority with which God has invested the Episcopate.

Lastly Mgr. Dupanloup, though by no means expressing himself with the same distinctness and the same energy, yet throws his whole weight into the same scale. "There are holy personages," he says, "great minds, councils, which have called for or decreed the periodical return of these holy assemblies . . . and these assemblies, while they have become more practicable, are more in harmony" than once they were "with *the wishes of Christian peoples*" (p. 49). As he must have written this with most clear remembrance of what had been said both by Mgr. Maret and by the "Correspondant," we do not think we press the matter at all too far, when we say that he has made himself responsible for their general view.

Now we would make two comments on the quotations here adduced. Firstly, as we have said, these writers surely show great blindness to the doctrine of the Church's infallibility in her magisterium. It is their very thesis, that, during more than three centuries, the great majority of Catholic bishops, in concert with the Holy See, have practically taught the faithful to credit the Holy Father with considerably more authority than God has really given him. Then, secondly, it seems to us that this is the first manifestation, since the Council of Basle, of what may be called practical Gallicanism. Bossuet's speculative view was doubtless, that every church should be governed by its own bishops, with comparatively small dependence on Rome: but his practical theory was, that the Church of France should be governed by the King, and that other churches might (for him) submit to Rome as profoundly as they pleased. Or turn to the Charles Butler school in England: so far from wishing to exalt the bishops' prerogative, Charles Butler rather wished to exalt the laity at their expense. But the writers now before us seem to desire that the Episcopate shall throw off its too great subservience (as they consider it) to the Roman Pontiff, and shall claim for itself as its due a far more independent action than it now exercises, in the general government of the Church. Nor should we omit to add—though we have had no space to exhibit the fact—that several persons of great influence in Germany, —many who are far from going Janus's lengths,—yet advance a good deal beyond the three French writers on whom we have been commenting. Speaking with the greatest possible diffidence, we cannot but think that here is presented a most serious element of future confusion and discord; and that some intervention of supreme authority would be most opportune.

We are now to conclude with briefly stating the argument which we would submit, founded on all that has been here drawn out. But in order to explain this argument, we must correct one misapprehension which seems rather widely prevalent. Several writers express themselves, as though the Church had already defined her own infallibility; and as though Archbishop Manning, e.g., were

desiring a gratuitous and novel *addition* to such her definition. Now we are the last to deny, that the Church has from the first taught as of faith the dogma of her own infallibility: but she has certainly never *defined* it. If the Vatican Council entertains the question, it will be the very first which has ever methodically considered the Church's infallibility at all; which has examined Scripture and Tradition, for the purpose of ascertaining the revealed doctrine on the subject. Nor do we indeed see how that doctrine *can* be defined, unless some definition is included both on its "subject" and its "object": both (1) on that authority (whether Pope or Pope and bishops) in which God has vested the gift; and also (2) on the *extent of sphere* over which the same gift extends. And as regards the "subject" of infallibility in particular,—since we have not the faintest doubt that the Pope, speaking ex cathedrâ, fulfils that function,—we can of course have no doubt *what* doctrine will be defined, if *any*.

Remarks altogether similar may be made, as to the Church's visible and corporate unity. She has indubitably from the first taught that dogma as of faith; and, moreover, several of her definitions in various ways imply it. But we are not aware of any definition in which it is expressly formulated.

We will now then give three reasons, which lead us humbly to hope that the Holy Ghost may inspire* the Council to put

* We have been criticised for using the word "inspiration" in our last number (p. 480), to express the Holy Ghost's influence over Pope or Council, when an infallible determination is issued. It is most certain that such "inspiration" is totally different in *kind* from the inspiration given to Scripture and to Apostles; nor have we anywhere seen the distinction more clearly drawn out, than by Dr. Murray in his work on the Church; disp. xi., nn. 20–26. For this reason the word "assistance" is far more commonly used in the above-mentioned sense, than the word "inspiration." And—though we were commenting on another's words and not choosing our own—still it would undoubtedly have been better if we had expressly referred to the distinction.

But we think our context would make it impossible, that any careful reader could misunderstand our meaning; or could suppose we were referring to any other "inspiration," than the inspiration of *illuminating grace*. Nor is this at all an unusual sense of the word. Thus Dr. Murray, in the very passage already cited, says, "*Deus . . . inspirando—mentes pastorum flectit et dirigit,*" &c. &c. The Bishop of Beauvais, the other day, in taking leave of his diocese on his departure for Rome, spoke of the Holy Ghost as the "*Divine Inspirer* of the Church and of Councils." The "*Civiltà*" of last November 6th, says that certain doctrines will or will not be defined by the Council, "accordingly as the Holy Ghost shall *inspire*" (p. 288). Orsi calls S. Agatho's letter "a divinely *inspired* Rule of the Catholic Faith. ("*De irreformabili,*" &c., i. c. xxiv. art. 3.) But we have graver authority still than any of these: for S. Leo declares that "the definition" of Chalcedon is, "*through divine inspiration*, indubitably consonant in all things with" true doctrine. (Letter to Julian of Cos: Letter 147.) We were led to look up this last passage, by a reference to it in a pamphlet of Mr. Ffoulkes's.

forth some definition on the Church's infallibility and (inclusively) on her corporate unity. Firstly, as we have more than once argued, in the present deplorable degradation of the European speculative intellect, the one bright spot amidst the darkness is the Church's presence; the one supporting and encouraging sound, amidst the Babel of discordant noises, is the Church's infallible voice. This then is one pressing need, which (it would seem) the Church can at once supply: viz., that her testimony to her own infallibility be placed in the clearest possible light; and that when Catholics allege that dogma against misbelievers, it shall not be possible for them to be met by the retort, that they are substituting their own private opinion for the Church's authentic doctrine. For secondly, as we have just implied, there are actually persons, calling themselves Catholics, who deny both the infallibility and the corporate unity of the Church; and one cannot but wish that these shall be expressly condemned, and that it shall be made impossible for them to be accounted Catholics. Lastly, the newly-revived practical Gallicanism would, in two different ways, be repressed by a full definition of infallibility. For, on the one hand (as we have urged), the whole view implies a strange blindness to one most vital portion of the Church's infallibility, viz., her infallible magisterium; and, on the other hand, the one practical particular, which at present unites these thinkers, is their denial that a definition on infallibility is opportune. If the Pope were defined to be infallible in his *ex cathedrâ* teaching, a light would thus be thrown on the unapproached greatness of his office, which would render this practical Gallicanism impossible.

However, at last, how little can be the value of an individual's conjecture! The Holy Ghost's ways are most different from man's ways; and a thousand remedies may be available for existing evils, which have not as yet even occurred to human intelligence. Two things only can we say on the matter with full confidence. Never was there a time when the Church more urgently needed "a great work of illumination and pacification"; and considering the circumstances and auguries under which the Vatican Council has met, never was there an assembly to which Catholics have more confidently looked up for the *achievement* of such a work.*

* Since the Council has assembled, writers of the English Protestant press have been labouring, but with scanty success, to apprehend the Church's constitution. They are familiar with modern political constitutions, in which the king "reigns but does not govern"; and for that reason they have peculiar difficulty in mastering the Catholic dogma, that God has given to Pius IX. supreme authority, not only over priests and laymen, but also over bishops, whether dispersed or assembled in council. Hence these writers are led to invent ingenious romances about episcopal indignation against Papal "tyranny," which about as much correspond with reality as does the record of Gulliver's travels.

Notices of Books.

Simple Explanations concerning the Co-operation of the Most Holy Virgin.
By F. Pierre Jeanjacquot, S.J. London : Philp.

THIS is not an ascetical work, but rather the foundation for an indefinite number of ascetical works. It may be described as a dogmatic exposition of what is intended in those epithets, "Co-redemptress," "Mother of Christians," the ascription of which to our Blessed Lady has received such high sanction from the Church. Some persons use these epithets with no adequate sense of what they imply; while others on the contrary, supposing the former to mean more than it does mean, protest against its use. We venture to think that all educated Catholics will do well to study this little work with the most serious attention, in order both that their devotion to our Blessed Lady be sufficiently pervasive and profound, and also that it may rest on an intelligent foundation. Dr. Pusey will, of course, see in it only one continued addition to the pure Gospel; but neither Dr. Pusey nor any one else will think of denying that, if those doctrines be really true which are here scientifically set forth, devotion to our Blessed Lady has the most intimate possible connection with a Christian's whole interior life. We should not ourselves hesitate to say, that the love of God and of our Blessed Lord receives altogether a new *quality*, when supported by the unintermitting and most tender worship of the Deipara.

The one obvious objection to the Catholic phrase, "Co-redemptress," is, that it denies the office of our Lord as Sole Redeemer. This difficulty arises (p. 10) from men forgetting that there are two different kinds of co-operation; and (p. 11) that where the co-operation takes place "by counsel, by instigation, by intercession, or by a *consent without which the work could not be accomplished*," the work still remains *exclusively* performed by its immediate agent. So (p. 7) it was Adam's sin which *exclusively* wrought man's fall; and yet Eve actively co-operated in that fall, because she incited Adam to do that which exclusively caused it. Moreover (p. 12) Eve's co-operation was formal and not merely material, because she knew she was exciting him to what involved man's ruin. In a parallel manner (p. 13), Christ Alone wrought man's whole redemption; and yet Mary as truly and as formally co-operated in man's redemption, as Eve in man's fall.

She co-operated of course in one sense, by the circumstance of becoming His Mother. But, if this were all, it could not be said (p. 16) that she is

the co-operatrix of *redemption*, except in a purely material sense. At the solemn moment of the Annunciation, man's redemption depended on the alternative, whether she would or would not give her consent. And the consent which she gave was not merely to the being Mother of God—that (p. 22) would have been simply an unparalleled exaltation and dignity—but she consented to His work of *redemption*; she consented to undergo all that unspeakable suffering and anguish, which were involved in her Son dying for the sins of the world. As Eve then *formally* co-operated in the fall, so Mary *formally* co-operated in the redemption.

When it is said however that redemption depended on Mary's consent, it must not be forgotten (p. 20) that this involved no "jeopardizing of God's work": because by His infallible grace He secured her consent, without in any way violating her perfect liberty of will.

F. Jeanjacquot gives a most special significance to this consent of our Blessed Lady, by maintaining (p. 123), "with all confidence," that at that very moment and ever afterwards she had "a clear and distinct knowledge of each" redeemed soul. We merely mention this opinion, without presuming to criticise it. We heartily agree with him, that such a supposition by no means "raises her beyond the rank of a pure creature" (p. 124); but we confess we should have been glad to see more direct evidence for a doctrine, most touching indeed and beautiful, but not commonly received. The quotations in p. 127 do not necessarily refer to her state *in vid*: and the only other authority which we can find alleged, is an anonymous "pious author," cited in p. 87, who says, that at the time of the Passion, she "received by divine revelation a knowledge of the sins of each and all of the children of Adam." However, we heartily hope there are grounds for accepting a doctrine, so singularly engaging and attractive to piety.

On the other hand it must not be forgotten, that the Co-redemptrix was herself redeemed; and the perfect harmony of these two facts is illustrated (p. 35) by a very striking parallel between Eve's relation to Adam and Mary's to Jesus. Moreover, she was redeemed with a higher redemption than any other creature; a redemption (p. 36) of preservation and not of deliverance: for she was redeemed by her Son's foreseen death from all sin, original and actual; nay (as we heartily follow many theologians in holding), from the very debitum proximum of original sin. We are a little surprised that the author before us has not referred one way or another to this latter doctrine.

Nor is Mary only men's Co-redemptrix; she is also their Mother. By this fact more is meant (p. 70) than that she bears to men the *affection* of a mother; she is literally my Mother, in a higher and truer sense even than my mother after the flesh can so be called. And who can tell the tenderness of her love for those whose Mother she has become through such bitter and transfixing anguish?

When such writers, then, as Dr. Pusey call on the Church to moderate her children's devotion to the tenderest of mothers, he is calling on her to take from them one of their very highest spiritual privileges; one of the very highest and surest means which she places at their disposal (p. 49), for growing in the love of God and of Christ.

We have confined ourselves to a mere indication of what our readers will

find in this invaluable little work, because we heartily hope they will procure it and study it most carefully for themselves. We may add, in conclusion, that it is dedicated to the English Jesuit Father Provincial, and introduced by a weighty preface from Archbishop Manning.

Popular Education at Home and Abroad; being Extracts from the Reports of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State of Popular Education in England, and of their Assistant Commissioners, on Popular Education in Germany, the United States, Canada, Holland, Switzerland, and France. London: Burns, Oates, & Co. 1869.

IRELAND will not very long occupy the whole attention of Parliament; and whenever it can spare time to think at all about England, national education will be one of the first, probably the very first subject discussed. There has long been a general feeling, that something must be done, and now there is hardly a newspaper without a report of some active proceedings on the part of those who are labouring to introduce compulsory secular education. They have the great advantage of being the assailants, and the assailants of a system which no one can unreservedly defend; for that which now exists notoriously fails to secure education for all children, and fails exactly in the places where there is most to be done. It is essential, therefore, that those who feel, that the plans of the party already in the field would be mischievous, should be prepared with counter plans of their own. Mere objection seldom holds its ground long against a definite and positive view, especially where there is a real evil to be met; and if those who desire to maintain denominational education would successfully meet the present agitation, they must have a clear notion of what they want, and especially of the changes which they are ready to introduce into the existing system.

Nothing, therefore, can be more seasonable at this moment than the pamphlet before us, which gives us the opinions of many trustworthy men as to the defects of the present system, and the means by which they may be met; and also puts within our reach, in small compass, the results of experience in every country in which compulsory secular education has been tried. No man who cares anything about national education should be without it. It gives us, in sixty-three pages, the parts bearing on this subject in six huge volumes, published by the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject. The first eleven pages consist of extracts from their Report, explaining what has hitherto been done to assist the education of the poor by Parliamentary grants, *i.e.* that Government has acted not by founding or maintaining schools, but by giving assistance to those who have founded and who still keep them up; and the results which have been obtained. The Parliamentary grant has assisted 9,388 schools, which contain 1,101,445 scholars and 32 training colleges. Government has expended on education £4,400,000, which have been met by about £8,800,000 raised by voluntary contributions. "Its system of inspection has raised the standard of educa-

tion, and by the careful training of its teachers, and, above all, by the introduction of pupil teachers, it has supplied the best means for teaching in schools." The Commissioners then give reasons why they think the system should not be superseded by any of those proposed instead of it, and especially why they object to a local rate in support of schools. All they say on this subject is well worth study. It is hardly possible to give any just conception of it by extracts. Indeed, the pamphlet before us, being compiled evidently with great care and by a person thoroughly acquainted with the subject from a work of huge dimensions, there is hardly a word in it which can be omitted without loss, and we would therefore earnestly refer every reader to the pamphlet itself.

But we would specially call attention to the pages which follow the extract from the Report. From page 14 to page 38 we have extracts from the Reports made to the Commissioners by assistants, whom they were empowered to send to examine into and report upon the state of education in other countries. The great value of these is, that the argument in favour of compulsory education has hitherto been, that it has been tried and has answered in other countries. An appeal is made to experiment; and these few pages enable us to see how the experiment has worked, and what are its results.

First, comes Germany. Mr. Pattison, Assistant Commissioner to report on German schools, shows that everywhere in Protestant Germany, and especially in Prussia, there is a strong movement against mixed education, and that, in fact, although great attempts were made by the Government many years ago to introduce secular education, it has been found to work so ill that there are now very few secular schools left. In the Rhine Province the Code Napoléon and the system of secular schools were both introduced when that province was held by France. It is remarkable, however, that although the Code is "retained as a cherished possession by the inhabitants of the left bank of the Rhine, the schools have almost all become confessional schools, and this without any legislative enactment, but by the mere current of circumstances. The *commune* still remains a civil corporation, with the obligation of building and maintaining both church and schools for the inhabitants within its boundaries, but the preference of confessional schools is now so decided, that Protestants and Catholics have invariably separate schools. In a parish where the Protestants are in a minority, for example, they will build and endow their own schools, and then oblige the *commune* to pay for it, and to contribute to the master's salary. They retain the right, all this while, to send their children to the original, or Catholic school, as it is there called; for the school, though legally common, has become Catholic by the secession of the Protestants." According to Mr. Pattison, therefore, the schools in Prussia, though professedly "mixed," are, in fact, "denominational," a state of things with which we are familiar in Ireland.

The next report is by Mr. Fraser, on the "common schools" of the United States. The theory of these is (or at least originally was), to teach a sort of general Christianity, without the peculiarities of any one Church or sect. This was the plan naturally adopted by a nation in which no one form of

Christianity prevailed, while yet there was a very strong feeling in favour of Christianity,—a feeling, the strength of which so much surprised De Tocqueville. Practically, they have become mere secular schools, although, as a sort of acknowledgment of the original intention, some part of the Holy Scriptures is read every day, and “almost everywhere provision is made for opening the work of the day with prayer.” But all men agree that these are mere ineffectual forms. Mr. Fraser says a general feeling is rising against these schools, as having, in truth, no religious character, and as not efficiently preserving even the interests of morality; which threatens the permanence and stability of the system.” There is a general preference for parochial schools, *i. e.*, schools connected with particular religious congregations or societies. He adds, “I confess to a doubt whether, in the course of another quarter of a century, all will go as smoothly with the common schools of America as it has gone for the last twenty-five years; whether, like many another ancient institution, they may not be put upon their trial, and even forced to yield to the restless reconstructing tendencies of the age.” He quotes “The Report of the State of Massachusetts,” showing that “parents withdraw their young children from what they fear to be the corrupting influence of the public schools.” After a testimony to the Catholic schools in Lower Canada, he sums up: “mixed schools, with religious instruction occupying a definite place in their programme, are a phenomenon hardly to be met with on the American Continent. No compromise and no comprehension have yet been discovered sufficiently skilful to appease, or sufficiently tolerant to embrace the mutual jealousies of Christian communities. It was so in the United States; it was so, though less prominently, in Upper Canada; it is so still, though in smaller proportions, here (in Lower Canada). It looks almost like a law of human nature that it shall be so everywhere.”

Mr. Matthew Arnold reports on the schools of Holland. By a law of 1806 a public school could not be denominational. All were to train children “for the exercise of all social and Christian virtues,” but no dogmatic instruction “was to be given by the teacher or in the school;” the Minister for the Home Department, however, was charged by the law to see that the Ministers of different communions should take on themselves “the religious instruction of the children of their persuasion.” The plan, it was boasted, worked well. The success was praised by M. Cousin. But, lo! it turned out that this success was only because the schools, while professing to be only “Christian,” were taught the established Protestantism of Holland. And when, in 1848, all religious denominations were put on terms of equality, the system at once broke down. The law was plain. The schools must not be denominational. But as soon as this law was practically enforced, the more religious Protestants found that they were utterly irreligious; in fact, they had hitherto been as religious as any Protestant schools could be, but then they were not really “mixed;” they were made practically “mixed,” but they at once ceased to be in any sense “religious.” The system is now being changed, and what will succeed does not yet appear. Mixed schools have evidently no chance.

On the French system, Mr. Arnold reports most favourably as to economy,

efficiency, &c. He says it is "religious, not in the sense in which all systems profess to be more or less religious, in inculcating the precepts of a certain universal and indisputable morality. It inculcates the doctrines of morality in the only way in which the masses of mankind ever admit them, or their connection with the doctrines of religion. Here it coincides with the systems of England and Germany. Morality, but dignified, but sublimed, by being taught in connection with religious dogma. This is what the French system makes the indispensable basis of its primary instruction."

Our own opinion as to the degree to which this just principle is really carried out by the French system does not agree with Mr. Arnold's. We believe it is very different in different parts of the country. We are sorry to say we know schools immediately under the Government, the teaching of which is decidedly anti-religious. This, however, does not affect the principle. It still remains the fact that the schools maintained by the French Government profess to be religious. Mr. Arnold's testimony to the contrast between the "sisters' schools" and lay schools is decided. He ends: "Is it then impossible, I perpetually asked myself, for people no longer under the world's charm, or who have never felt it, to associate themselves, and to work happily, combinedly, and effectually, unless they have first adhered to the Council of Trent?" As to Switzerland, he gives a very curious account of the tyranny of the "Liberals" in the canton of Fribourg, where they obtained power owing to the war of the *Sunderbund*. Happily the first free election deprived them of it.

As to the general results of these reports, it appears first, with regard to compulsory attendance, that in Germany the attendance is as good in the few states where the law does not exist as in those in which it does. Moreover, as soon as circumstances have arisen in those states in which schooling is by law compulsory which cause any real difficulty, and might be supposed to show the benefit of the compulsory system, there it has at once broken down. Upon this subject the experience of the district of Saxony in which the cotton manufacture has been introduced is very important (see p. 42). In Prussia also, "all who have to do with the elementary schools agree that their great difficulty" is to secure the regular attendance of the children whose names are on the books. The causes which prevent regular attendance seem to operate much as they do in England (p. 44). "In *Württemberg* there is a party who contend for the abrogation of compulsory school attendance. . . . This party do not take their stand on any abstract principle of protection of liberty to the individual, but on the observed effect on the practice of Government administration. They maintain that if compulsory attendance ceased to be law, the schools would be as well attended as they are now."

Attendance is compulsory in four cantons of French Switzerland, and not in the fifth (*Geneva*). Mr. Arnold reports that the attendance is better in *Geneva* than in the others. He gives in detail the obstacles which hinder regular attendance, and one would say he was speaking of England. As to the canton of *Vaud*, he sums up: "Not that primary instruction is unprosperous. On the contrary, it is most flourishing. What I say is, that the making it compulsory by law has not there added one *iota* to its prosperity. Its prosperity is due to the general comfort and intelligence of the population,

where these are equally present (as in Geneva), the prosperity of education is equal, though there is no compulsion. Where these fail, the compulsion of the law is powerless to prevent the inevitable check inflicted on education by their absence."

In France and Holland education is not compulsory. In the United States, Mr. Fraser reports: "It would seem that the condition of schools in America, as respects both the percentage of attendance and the period of attendance, is no better than, indeed hardly as good as, the average condition of those in England."

Our readers must excuse the length of these extracts. The general result is, that compulsion could not practically be brought to bear in a state of society like ours; that mixed schools, to teach a sort of common Christianity, are a delusion: they have in all cases resulted, and no doubt always will result, in one of two things—either in mere secular schools of an anti-religious and immoral tendency, or else in schools virtually denominational under the pretence of being mixed.

Secondly, as to a school-rate, the objection felt by thinking men of every variety of religious opinions is, that effective as it would be in securing the universal establishment of schools, it would be fatal to their efficiency; for English custom would require that schools supported by local rates should be subject to local management. But local managers will be sure to wish to limit both the standard of teaching and the expense of the school. A more serious objection is, that the religious character of the school could not be maintained.

The Commissioners, while objecting on these grounds to "the peculiar form of parochial rating," propose "that the public assistance given to schools should be derived in part from local taxation." The pamphlet does not explain this recommendation, an omission which we regret. What the Commissioners recommend is, that while the grant for the central government should depend only on the number of children in the school, there should be an additional subvention from the county-rate, to be granted for results upon the report of inspectors to be appointed by a local board. We greatly doubt whether any system of supporting schools by local taxation will be found free from fundamental objections. After all, the objection which will, we think, be most generally felt in England is, that rate-supported schools could not fail to destroy the great system of schools already existing, and which we owe to the benevolence and religious convictions of our country. Nothing could be more consistent than this with English customs. It is of a piece with those hospitals "supported by voluntary contributions," by which foreign travellers are struck as one of the most remarkable characteristics of England. To extinguish this great system which has already succeeded, in order to try one which has indeed been tried in many countries, but of which it seems at least doubtful whether it ever did, in any country, obtain permanent success, would be to carry mere theory to the wildest extreme.

We heartily trust then, that English Catholics at least will unite as one man to demand the continuance of the present system in all its main features. The extracts from the evidence given before the Commissioners by Mr. Allies suggests, we think, the only really important change which it needs; that is,

the alteration of the rule which makes local subscriptions to a large amount necessary in all cases as a condition *sine quâ non* of public aid. Nothing could be more reasonable in the case of the Established Church, the members of which hold by far the larger proportion of the landed property of the country, to say nothing of the Church property. There is no place in which the poor members of that communion are out of proportion to the rich. The case of the Catholic is the exact reverse. Circumstances have accumulated great multitudes of poor Catholics in towns or other situations, many of which are almost without wealthy Catholics. In such cases it is evidently unjust to make the amount of local subscriptions the sole test of the need of a Catholic school. A modification of this rule is so manifestly equitable, that it can hardly be opposed except by those whose real desire is to prevent the establishment of Catholic schools. The rulers of the nation will very greatly fail in their duty, if they allow mere bigotry like this to prevent another generation of Catholic children from receiving any secular schooling. To prevent them from being Catholics is, thank God, beyond its power. The only alternative is whether they shall be Catholics well instructed or Catholics without education. And the public interest as well as their own must decide this question.

We feel no doubt that the Catholic body will be united as one man in contending that, instead of adopting the thoroughly un-English system of compulsory secular schools supported by rates, which a league has just been founded to demand, the Government should maintain the system which has gradually grown up out of English customs to meet English needs, in the manner suited to English institutions, only extending it to those parts of the country in which its benefits have as yet been imperfectly experienced, and perfecting, from time to time, whatever is necessary to increase its efficiency. We do not underrate the influence and zeal of those who are pressing for the system which we oppose. But we have no great fear of their ultimate success. The pamphlet before us has impressed upon us more strongly than ever the conviction that, even if they could obtain an Act of Parliament to sanction their plan (which we think very unlikely), it would be found in practice hardly possible to work it. Such has, in fact, been the result wherever it has as yet been tried, whether in Europe or America. And we think few will question that either secular schools, or compulsory schools, or schools supported by local taxation, would be more directly opposed to the national habits and institutions of England, than to those of any country in which they have hitherto been tried: and therefore more difficult, we may say impossible, to work successfully.

The Address delivered at the Catholic Meeting in the Town Hall, Birmingham, November 15, 1869. By the Right Rev. Bishop ULLATHORNE. Birmingham : M. Maher & Co.

WE have spoken at length, elsewhere, upon the education question. We are, however, bound thankfully to notice, that the Bishop of Birmingham has already put himself at the head of a public movement upon the subject. There is plainly no time to be lost. The enemy is already in the field ; and the remark of the Bishop was most important, when he said that although the great majority of our countrymen are sure to be against the proposals of the new Education League, because " they are Christians, in one sense or another, and their Christian feelings will rise up against this un-Christian contrivance," yet we must remember, that " it is not by majorities, but by earnest, united, untiring minorities, that questions are carried in this country ; and so it will be with this un-Christian scheme, unless the advocates of religious education arise and do their part in resisting its introduction." The denominational system has, indeed, the two great advantages, of being in possession, and of being suited to the habits, principles, and institutions of the people of England. This, however, does not put it out of danger, unless those who care for it do their duty, and combat boldly and patiently in its defence ; although it is the surest pledge of their success if they do.

The Birmingham meeting was attended by a number of men who command the respect of Catholics. It was addressed by the Earl of Denbigh, Lord Howard of Glossop, Mr. Gainsford of Sheffield, Canon O'Sullivan, and Mr. Robert Berkeley. But the subject was chiefly explained by the Bishop. He stated the principles of the proposed plan to be, that schools should be, 1. compulsory ; 2. merely secular ; 3. supported by a local rate ; 4. managed by a Board elected by the ratepayers. And each one of these, as the Bishop put each of them to the meeting, was indignantly rejected. He then met the objections to denominational education, 1. that it is an obstacle to national education ; 2. that it " causes a waste of teaching power " ; and 3. " tends to stereotype instead of softening down religious distinctions." As to the second, he said, " The waste will be the other way. In the system proposed, the soul, which is the chief part of a man, is to be left in the school, an uncultivated waste, with nothing to feed on but the hard, dry, sapless bits and scraps of natural morality, selected with the view of excluding from them Christian doctrines and Christian motives. Now this kind of moral teaching puts the self-reliance of man in the place of his dependence on God. It inculcates the duty of man to man, without resting the sense of that duty upon his conscience, and his duty to God. It teaches obedience to human and social laws, without resting them on their only firm foundation, which is the command and law of God. It urges the pursuit of truth, while it stops short of that Divine eternal and revealed Truth, from which all other truth derives its light and its significance. It teaches youth to think, but stays him from thinking of God. It prescribes the rights of man, but it discards the rights of God ; and when the rights of God are discarded, the rights of man have but poor and feeble powers of enforcement left them." As for the last objec-

tion, his Lordship said, "That is precisely the reason why we object to these secular schools; because one of their distinct aims, as here admitted, is to soften down, to starve out, those great doctrinal truths, which God has revealed and commanded us to believe, to confess, and to hold with firm tenacity, in face of all the powers of this world. We resist and reject these godless schools, for the very reason that the faith of our Catholic children would be weakened in them, and even sacrificed." The Bishop made a very telling point by showing that these secular schools, which are professedly independent of all sects, will really teach, fully and exclusively, the principles of one sect. For we have among us those who "reject the mysteries, the miracles, and the Sacraments of religion. The country may be broadly divided into those who believe in revealed mysteries of religion expressed by some definite creed, and those who have no such belief. But such a system of undenominational schools expresses the principles of the last, and not the principles of the first—of the minority, and not of the majority." His lordship said, we have no objection to that sect, like any other, having its own schools, but he protested against our being compelled to support them by rates from which our own were to have no aid, and still more from any sort of compulsion as to the attending them, which would be simply to raise up the penal laws again, and would stir up such a conflict of power and principles, as this country has not seen since it ceased to be felony and forfeiture of goods, and proof of treason against the State, for a Catholic to teach a school, or to send his children to Catholic schools." He spoke without objection of "a conscience clause of a proper kind" in places where there are not children enough of any denomination to make a school of their own possible; and added, "It is the common usage with us, when Protestants send their children to our schools, to send for the parents and ask them whether they wish their children to learn the Catholic Catechism and prayers or not, and their wish on that subject is complied with, whether it is for or against their learning them." Lastly, as to the proposal that the schools should be managed by a Board similar to that of guardians, he declared that in such a case "we should be much in the position of the Irish Catholics in New Ross, when, being besieged by Cromwell, they demanded freedom of conscience on condition of surrender. Cromwell replied, 'I meddle with no man's conscience; but if by liberty of conscience you mean liberty to say Mass; where the Parliament of England has power, that will not be allowed.'" We have noticed only a small part of the Bishop's very effective speech. It should be mentioned, however, that M. Poncia, a Catholic well known in Birmingham for his zeal and liberality, said that "up to that evening he thought he had come to a clear and proper understanding of the question, in holding a view different from that which had been advocated that evening. He confessed, however, that he had been made a convert by the Bishop's able speech."

The Bishop's appeal has been discussed very characteristically by several of the London papers.

The *Spectator* devotes to it a leading article, marked with its usual ability and fairness. The *Times*, hitherto opposed to the League, came out, two days after the meeting, with "an attack upon the speech, very nearly tantamount to a change of sides." The *Pall Mall Gazette* made a strong declaration, in an

article upon poor Mr. Ffoulkes, against any system which implies national support of Catholic schools. The *Spectator* points out—"The main strength of the League in the middle class (as distinguished from the working class), is far less attachment to the principle involved, than a latent feeling that, if carried, it would give us a better logical standing-ground for refusing the Catholic demand for denominational education in Ireland. There is no longer any disposition to inflict political disabilities on Roman Catholics. But there is growing up a very strong fear of Roman Catholic encroachment, and an almost nervous wish to find a tenable ground for refusing their next claim, without incurring the appearance of restoring religious inequality."

... "All the Protestant jealousies caused by the disestablishment of the Irish Protestant Church, and all the reluctant adhesions given to that just measure, are likely to compensate themselves for their recent chagrin by uniting to resist the demand for denominational education in Ireland. And we suspect that not a few of the warmest supporters of the Birmingham scheme are animated by the feeling that, if carried, it will strengthen the hands of Government in resisting any such change in Ireland. The partial adhesion which seems to have been given to the secular principle on the part of the Scotch Free Church, is due, we doubt not, in some measure to this *arrière pensée*, as to the Irish campaign. And, assuming this to be so, it is obvious that the Birmingham scheme will not be the less warmly supported, if it becomes evident that it will not only prepare an efficient weapon with which to resist the Roman Catholic claims in Ireland, but will also strike a blow at the much less important body of English Roman Catholics." The *Spectator* earnestly protests against "this half-confessed wish of Protestants to force upon the people of Ireland a system of education which is unpopular with the majority," throwing to the winds the childish argument that the decision of the Irish people on the subject is owing to the influence of the priesthood; for if so, "it is clear that that influence is paramount with the people"; and "still more strongly against the almost unmanly policy of allowing the opportunity for a clever political manoeuvre in Ireland to bias our judgment as to the wisest and soundest educational policy in England." "If the extension of the denominational system is good in itself, then we ought to consider it only an additional advantage that it is as acceptable to the Irish Roman Catholics, as the 'unsectarian' or secular system is the reverse. If it be not good in itself, then it ought to be counted as one real disadvantage in adopting the other scheme, that the Roman Catholics excessively dislike it. We fear the feeling with most Liberals is the other way; those they count the offence to the Roman Catholics as an advantage, and the favour of the Roman Catholics as an offence."

The merit of this conspicuous fairness is greatly increased by the fact, that the *Spectator* has very strong religious views of its own, and that it believes *

* It would take us away from the subject if we were to enter on the question whether it may not be the case with the *Spectator* as with many other Protestants, that the most religious parts of their system, and that to which they are most firmly attached, are not really inconsistent with Catholic doctrine, but in truth are part of it.

the Catholic system to be most directly and strongly opposed to them. It has returned to the same view of the subject more than once since. It even questions whether our acting in the matter may not injure the cause we desire to serve, by pointing out to such liberal bigots the fact that secular education is to us the greatest of abominations. We do not agree with it. We are sure that, if we said nothing, those who hate our religion far more than they love their own, or even than they love that constitutional freedom to which they profess their highest worship, would learn from their own instinctive feelings, that they can do us no greater injustice, and offer us no fouler insult, than that of compelling us to maintain, at our own expense, free schools, which, as the Bishop of Birmingham has shown, would really be devoted to teaching exclusively the doctrines of the sect most directly opposite to our religion; namely, that of the men who teach that upon religious matters nothing can be known with certainty, and therefore, that while everything else is taught, that one subject should be respectfully passed by, in education and in the other practical affairs of life, as a thing of which it is useless to think or speak at all. They will feel also, whether we speak out or not, that this injustice and insult will be increased if the establishment of the proposed schools can be so managed, that our own schools (which already contain more children than those of any sect in the country, except the Establishment, and which are rapidly increasing) should be shut up by the competition of the new Government system. There is no need to tell them all this, they well know it; and if we held our peace they would only wonder at our blindness or our indifference, and rejoice that by our silence we made it possible for them to strike us a fatal blow, while professing not to intend that it should reach us. This is now admitted to have been the course adopted through a long life by one of our ablest opponents, the Protestant Archbishop Whately. He was, for many years, an active member of the Irish Education Board, the fundamental principle of which, as laid down by Lord Derby when it was founded, was to preclude all possibility of proselytism. All through his life he loudly professed to maintain the original principles of the Board; and when, at last, he left it, his professed reason was, that by allowing the Catholic managers of schools to dispense with the use of some religious books teaching the "truths held by all denominations," which he had himself drawn up for that purpose, they were departing from those original principles. Now his daughter, Miss Whately (of "Birdsnest" notoriety), evidently through inadvertence, published in his *Life*, vol. ii. p. 244, some notes supplied her by Mr. Senior, in which he recorded what Dr. Whately told him of his real objects and hopes in supporting these mixed schools. He said to Mr. Senior:—"The education supplied by the National Board is gradually UNDERMINING the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church." Words never to be forgotten, and which ought to be engraven upon the heart of every Catholic. Their importance, however, is that they were not any inconsiderate saying of Dr. Whately's. They do not express any mere momentary feeling. Far from it. Any one who reads Mr. Senior's notes will see that what he here says was his deliberate opinion, that he returned to the subject again and again on different days, and approached it from different sides, always to express more strongly his conviction that the only way to *undermine* (it is his own

phrase) the religion of the Irish people is by *mixed education* ;* that without mixed education, no degree of secular instruction, and no familiarity with

* Page 246 he said :—" I believe, as I said the other day, that *mixed education* is gradually enlightening the mass of the people, and that *if we give it up we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from Popery*. But I cannot venture openly to profess this opinion. I cannot support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion. I have to fight its battle with one hand, and that my best, tied behind me." Page 247 :—" With all its defects, we must adhere to the system of mixed education." An attempt was made (if we remember right in the *Times*) to show that Dr. Whately meant only, that education and enlightenment would gradually open the eyes of the people, and that then they would adopt the system which he believed to be true. This was ingenious, but disingenuous. Whoever reads his own words will see that he said, over and over again, that education, so far from injuring the Catholic Church in Ireland, would strengthen it, unless it were *mixed education*, and if it were mixed education it would *undermine* it. Thus he said, p. 246 :—" What I fear is a measure which, though not avowedly sectarian, may be so practically. I fear that a grant may be offered to any patron who will provide such secular education as the Government shall approve, leaving him to furnish such religious education as he may himself approve. If this be done the schools in Roman Catholic districts will be so many hotbeds of bigotry and religious animosity." By these last ugly words Whately of course meant "earnest Catholic religion." But no words could more strongly express his conviction, that no degree of secular education would "undermine" the Catholic religion, unless it were *mixed education*. That was his one hope, and, as he was convinced, the only hope, of "undermining" the religion of the Irish Catholics. Again, in page 245, he says, "Only two things are necessary ; one is, that Government should adhere resolutely, not only on its measures, but by its appointments, in the selection of [Protestant] bishops, as well as in making Parliamentary grants, to the system of *mixed education*." In page 244 he says of his own religious books, which he had managed to get the Catholic members of the Board to accept (and of which he always said publicly, that they were in accordance with the principles of the national system, the first of which was to preclude all possibility of proselytism), "they contain so much that is inconsistent with the spirit of Romanism, that it is difficult to suppose a person well acquainted with them can be a thorough-going Roman Catholic. His trust in the infallibility [of the Church], the foundation on which his whole system of faith is built, is at an end." What makes this case much stronger is that he was here speaking of his "extracts" from Scripture. Now, it was exactly these extracts which we used to be told were chosen, because there was nothing in them to which any one could object. Well, Dr. Whately himself tells us that his object in making these selections was, to suggest to the Catholic scholars disbelief in "the foundations on which their whole system of faith is built," and that this was the principal way in which he believed that he was undermining the whole fabric of their faith. He was confessedly a far-sighted man, and he saw that no degree of mere instruction, whether in secular learning or in Holy Scripture, would endanger their faith, as long as it was given in a Catholic school, by Catholic teachers, and united with Catholic devotions, acts of faith, hope, and charity, &c., &c., but that, if given in a mixed school, it would undermine their religion. It was because he was no longer allowed to enforce the use of this very book in all national schools for Catholic children that he resigned his place on the Board.

Scripture, would do any harm to the Catholic religion, and that so long as mixed education was maintained, there was little to fear from any other concession which it might be necessary to make to the Catholics, for that by it their religion would be gradually "undermined." This important fact should never be allowed to sleep : *fas est ab hoste doceri*. Above all, it is a sufficient answer to those Protestants who tell us, often in good faith, that the proposed plans of mixed education are not intended to be, and need not be, any blow to the Catholic religion. Every Catholic who is liable to meet such persons should have Dr. Whately's words by heart, ready prepared as an answer to them.

And this answers also a suggestion of the *Spectator* that it is not fair to speak of the proposed plan of mixed schools as a penal law against the Catholic religion, because "a Protestant nation, though it should always endeavour to meet the views of the Roman Catholics it contains, must obviously solve its own educational problems with a view to the wants of the majority, and not to the wants of the minority." This is true ; and the *Spectator*, with its usual fairness, does not deny that it would be a "grievance," a "misfortune" to Catholics if the Protestant majority were to establish a school rate in support of mixed schools. But surely when, as this writer admits, that grievance and misfortune is threatened, not because Protestants *bond fide* believe that a mixed system is, on the whole, best for their own children, but because they believe it will be an injury to the Roman Catholic religion, no proof of an animus of persecution could be more formal and complete. The penal laws themselves were less so ; for the penal laws, while they were intended to strike down the Catholic religion, inflicted loss and inconvenience only upon Catholics, whereas, in this case, the *Spectator* admits that men are willing to sacrifice for their own children the mode of education which they believe to be best for them, only that they may obtain an excuse for inflicting on our children one which we know to be destructive to them. In this case, therefore, people are confessedly desiring to make a great personal sacrifice in order to injure us.

It cannot be too much to say, that if the most important Irish questions are now to be decided by the Imperial Parliament, not (as Mr. Gladstone promised last year) so as to meet the wishes of the Irish people, but expressly and intentionally so as to "undermine" that religion, which, as the Irish people have shown a thousand times, they value more than their lives, the very worst spirit of times past will be proved to be still dominant. Still, as then, Ireland will be governed, not so as to meet its own highest and best aspirations, but so as to gratify the lowest passions of its English masters. We therefore deliberately declare, that this question of mixed or denominational education in Ireland seems to us to be, before all others, that upon which it depends, whether the Union is to be in future maintained merely as a matter of might against right, or whether, like the union of Scotland with England, it is to be a bargain just and beneficial to both parties.* It has been the

* The *Spectator* objects to Dr. Ullathorne's calling the proposed mixed schools "godless." It is, however, merely a quotation from that starchy Protestant Sir R. H. Inglis, who applied it to mixed education in Ireland.

opinion of some thoughtful men that between a Protestant nation and a Catholic nation no really just and beneficial union, upon terms at all approaching to equality can exist for any length of time ; but that between such nations the only permanent connection must be that of ascendancy and subjection, such as has been too long exemplified in the past history of Ireland. Their reason has been, that the hatred of Protestants against the Catholic religion is such, as to make any other permanent union impossible, and that, whenever it was attempted, it would be sure to lead to something like a religious war between the two. Mr. Gladstone is now trying a great practical experiment—he is bringing this opinion to the test of experience. If experience proves that the hatred of Englishmen against the Catholic religion is so deep-seated that they are ready to sacrifice for themselves in England the system of education which they believe to be the best, rather than allow Catholic Ireland to enjoy the benefit of it, that opinion will have been confirmed by the test of experiment : and just men of all nations will feel, that the hope of just government in Ireland must be given up, until some providential change shall put within her power a final separation from England.

Joannis Baptistæ Franzelin e Societate Jesu in Collegio Romano S. Theologiæ Professoris Tractatus de Deo Trino Secundum Personas.
Roma et Taurini apud P. Marietti. 1869.

THOSE of our readers who have had the privilege of "sitting under" Father Franzelin, need no words of ours in recommendation of this treatise. The name of the great master is sufficient guarantee of the quality of the work to all who have heard him. Such will picture him in fancy as he sits in the theological chair of the Roman College of the Jesuits, striving with earnest eloquence to force into the heads of his many-tongued audience an understanding of truths whose inmost depths his own eye seems to pierce undazzled.

But every lover of sound and solid theology will heartily welcome this third instalment of the learned professor's *Cursus*. The volume is distinguished by the same characteristics as marked the two treatises before published—"De Sacramentis in Genere" and "De Eucharistiâ." There is the same profoundness and accuracy of thought ; the same exactness and fulness of learning ; the same critical and exegetical power ; the same sound and wary orthodoxy ; the same pervasive yet unobtrusive piety ; the same unity and completeness of treatment. In short, Father Franzelin is a theologian *omnibus numeris absolutus*, and his treatise "De Deo Trino," bears witness to the fact on every page.

As a specimen of theological criticism, the fourth Thesis (p. 38 *et seq.*), in which the authenticity of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses" (1 John v. 7), is demonstrated, leaves nothing to be desired. The tenth and eleventh Theses (p. 138 *et seq.*), on the faith and language of the ante-

Nicene Fathers, are at once an admirable specimen of exegesis, and have a special value at this time in connection with unsound theories of development. So again the full treatment of that most beautiful and delicate question—*de Inhabitatione Spiritûs Sancti*—(p. 557 *et seq.*), evidently undertaken by the author in order to dissipate the darkness which hangs over the point in some recent popular text-books, is most valuable in itself; as well as instructive as an example of the folly of attempting to study the Fathers without theological training, and of the danger of half-knowledge.

And here we are brought, by a natural transition, to speak of a point to which attention has already been called in our former notice of Father Franzelin (DUBLIN REVIEW, July, 1869, p. 222). The present writer has always regarded the method of our author as his most distinguishing characteristic, and one which marks the advent of a new era in theology. The older scholastics used Scripture and Fathers too sparingly; among the followers of Petavius, history and criticism pushed theology proper into the background; in Suarez the philosophical and positive elements are found side by side, but independent of each other. It has been left for the theologians of our own and future times to harmonize, amalgamate, and unify the *loci theologici*. It is from this point of view that we especially rejoice in the labours of the illustrious professor. From the first page to the last of all his works, he keeps consistently before his eyes the great principle, that theology is the science of revelation; and that consequently not only doctrine itself (*quod sit*), but the understanding of doctrine (*quid sit*), and deductions from doctrine (*quomodo sit*) are all to be sought in the one authoritative source, which includes all others, viz., Catholic Tradition. And thus philosophy in the hands of Father Franzelin becomes not so much the handmaiden of theology as her daughter, and wears the dress and features of the superior science. "*Sicut vero hoc alterum* (he writes in the advertisement to *de Sacram. in Gen.*), *quod ita est, constat auctoritate verbi Dei, ita etiam investigatio rationum quomodo sit, in Sacra theologia potissimum peragitur deductione ex ipso Dei verbo, ut in Ecclesiâ et ab Ecclesiâ Christi (assistente Spiritu veritatis) custoditur, prædicatur, explicatur.*" As in so many other cases error has been the occasion of a more profound apprehension and exact analysis of truth, so here the aberrations of the school of Günther and Froschammer have given a direction to the studies of orthodox theologians and philosophers. What F. Kleutgen has done for philosophy F. Franzelin is doing for theology; and in the treatise before us he has constantly in view the tenets of the rationalising Catholics of Munich and Tübingen.

From what we have said it will be apparent how valuable would be a treatise on the method of theological science from the pen of our author. He has promised a contribution to the literature of this subject, and we sincerely hope that his duties at the Council may not prevent the carrying out of his intention at an early date.

We may add, for the sake of those who have the lithographed sheets of the treatise "*De Deo Trino*," that the printed edition is enriched with a copious, and (as far as we have looked) an accurate index.

Du Pape et Du Concile, ou Doctrine Complète de S. ALPHONSE DE LIGUORI sur ce double Sujet. Traités traduits classés et annotés par le P. Jules Jacques, C.SS.R. Casterman, Tournai.

THE publication of this collection of S. Alphonsus de Liguori's various treatises on the Pope and on General Councils is most opportune. While all eyes are turned towards Rome, it is well that the clergy and educated laity should thus be enabled to learn, what one so high in esteem for sanctity and learning as S. Alphonsus thought on these subjects. It is a happy coincidence, too, that this volume should have appeared in the same language and at the same time as the Pastoral Letter of the Bishop of Orleans.

That letter came from one so greatly admired for his eloquence and zeal that it made much more impression on men's minds than its contents alone could account for; especially among the laity, who have never given a special study to the questions of which it treats. Among some few an impression actually exists, that the illustrious French Bishop has defended the cause of moderation and of the ancient traditions of the Church against, as it is maintained, the extreme theories of a few theologians and the hasty speculations of some intemperate laymen.

We recommend those who have received this impression to purchase and read attentively the volume before us.

In the excellent Introduction which has been prefixed to his translation by P. Jacques, they will find in what esteem S. Alphonsus and his writings are held by the Church. To quote but one passage from the bull of his canonization, having reference to the very treatises which compose this volume, Gregory XVI. has said: "(The Saint) wrote many books for the maintenance of the rights of this Apostolic See; in them we admire an extraordinary vigour of argument, a vast and varied learning, singular proofs of his solicitude for the Church, and a rare zeal for religion." Passing to the writings of the Saint thus solemnly praised, the reader will find that S. Alphonsus maintains, with all the erudition of a doctor and the earnestness of a saint, propositions exactly contrary to those of the Bishop of Orleans. The latter, although he professes not to discuss in any way the infallibility of the Pope but only the opportuneness of its definition, yet continually assumes that hitherto it is not held generally in the Church. He speaks as if the definition would introduce *a new rule of faith*.*

S. Alphonsus, on the contrary, maintains with Suavez and Bellarmin that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope is *proxima fidei*, closely allied to what is of faith; that it is the ancient and almost universally

* Mais avec la nouvelle règle de foi, ne semblerait-il pas aux fidèles qu'il n'y a plus qu'un juge réel? (§ xii.).

received rule of faith, based on Scripture and tradition; and though not yet expressly defined as of faith, that it is expressly taught by Sovereign Pontiffs and by General Councils.

Alexander VIII. had condemned the following proposition: "The assertion of the authority of the Roman Pontiff above a General Council, and of his infallibility in defining questions of faith, is vain, and has been often refuted." S. Alphonsus concludes the dissertation which he has written against this proposition, by saying that the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility is the belief and practical rule of the whole Church: *totius Ecclesiæ sententiam, regulam et sensum*.

The Bishop of Orleans says, that since all Catholics are agreed that *the Church* is infallible, and this belief has been sufficient for eighteen centuries, it is inopportune and productive of great evils to raise the question as to the exact seat of infallibility; that "at the very statement of the problem, the devil is on the alert, the faithful are troubled, the East is arrested in its approach, Protestants are driven back, governments become uneasy, the saddest pages of history are again brought to view, bishops are grieved, the peace of souls is compromised, and the road of salvation made more difficult" (§ xvi.).

S. Alphonsus thought very differently. "Febronius," he writes, "pretends that the supreme authority which we ascribe to the Pope keeps heretics from joining the Church. He is mistaken. It is not the doctrine regarding the Pope, but hatred of restraint, sensual delights, the love of riches, and pride, which keep them separated from the Church. They make no more account of the authority of Councils, in which Febronius places the supreme power, than they do of that of the Popes."

So far was the Saint from thinking it inopportune to raise the question of the exact seat of infallibility, that he has written no less than three treatises to prove the infallibility of the Pope and his superiority to General Councils, and has been praised for doing so by the Holy See. He goes out of the way to treat of these questions even in his moral theology. The ecclesiastical censor at Naples thought it inopportune to publish such matters: but the Saint answered: "You may change, if you like, certain reflections . . . but if it is a question regarding the supreme authority of the Pope, then no. I am ready to give my life in its defence. Take away this supreme power, and I do not fear to say that the authority of the Church is annihilated."

The Bishop of Orleans at great length endeavours to show the almost inextricable difficulties which will arise, both as regards the past and the future, if the rule of faith is placed in the infallibility of the Pope. S. Alphonsus, on the other hand, sees no issue out of the historical difficulties of the past, and no practical rule for the future, for those who reject this infallibility. He does not see how any Council can be certainly known to have been œcumenical, or to have fulfilled the conditions which even Gallicans require in order that the definitions of an Ecumenical Council may be infallible, except from the infallible judgment and approbation of the Pope; so that, to use his own words, "even the adversaries of the Pope's infallibility cannot find complete

assurance in matters of faith without coming in a last analysis, by one road or another, to acknowledge in the Pope a supreme and infallible authority" ("Du Pape," &c., p. 71).

Again, the Bishop of Orleans says that if the infallibility of the Pope is admitted, the faithful will never be able to understand that the bishops are in any true sense judges of the faith; but "the fact is," answers S. Alphonsus, "that the supreme power, which before the Council resided entirely and exclusively in the Pope, in the Council extends also to the bishops, and is shared by them; so that they can say in all truth in the definitions pronounced unanimously by the Pope and Council, *Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis*" (*ib.*, p. 75).

Neither does it follow, as the Bishop of Orleans insists, that General Councils will be esteemed useless if the infallibility of the Pope is admitted. As this is the most specious part of his lordship's letter, it may be well to set down the objection as he stated it, and the answer supplied by S. Alphonsus.

"Councils," says Mgr. Dupanloup, "have, up to the present time, been one of the great forms of the Church's life, one of its most powerful means of action. They began in the very origin of the Church in Apostolic times; they have been known to every century of Christianity except the last two."

Then, after stating his desire and hope that they may in future become periodical, he continues:—

"But, if the Council should define the infallibility of the Pope, might not the faithful think and say:—'What use in future will there be in Œcumenical Councils? Since the Pope alone, apart from the bishops, can decide infallibly on questions of faith, why call together the bishops? Why undergo the delays, the researches, the discussions of Councils?'

"Thus, then, it is wished that the Council shall make a decree which in future would either put an end to Councils, or at least diminish their number and importance! It is wished that the bishops should decree, so to say, their own abdication" (§ xii).

First, then, S. Alphonsus also reviews past ages, and concludes that Councils neither were nor could be the regular means of defining controversies:—

"If God had not appointed," he says, "that the definitions of the Popes should be infallible, but had willed that questions of faith should be decided in General Councils, *he would not have made sufficient provision for the good of the Church*; for, considering the numerous difficulties which stand in the way of convoking general Councils, the Church would have been deprived, during the greater number of centuries, of an infallible judge, capable of applying a prompt remedy to the schisms and heresies which may ever be arising.

"As a matter of fact, the constant practice of the Church proves that heresies have been condemned by the Sovereign Pontiffs alone; and when the definition of the Pope has been pronounced, Councils have only been assembled when it could be done conveniently, and when it was considered useful to convoke them in order to *extinguish more completely the fire of some heresy that was spreading*" (p. 165).

As to the objection, that the infallibility of the Pope makes Councils useless, S. Alphonsus says :—

“No; though the Pope is infallible, yet Councils are not useless. On the contrary, they are useful in many respects. 1st. In order that the people may receive more readily the decrees which have been unanimously drawn up. 2ndly. That the Bishops may have a more perfect knowledge of the doctrines discussed, and of the reasons on which the decrees are based, and that thus they may be better able to instruct the faithful with regard to them. 3rdly. They are useful to close the mouths of those who resist the definitions of the Pope. 4thly. They are useful for the better examination of certain points not yet defined nor sufficiently discussed. Though it must be well understood that to have authority the definitions of Councils must be confirmed by the Pope, seeing that they derive all their force from this confirmation” (p. 168).

With regard to this latter point the Saint adds, in another place :—

“Sometimes the Sovereign Pontiffs convoke Councils in order that they may be more enlightened by the Holy Ghost by means of the discussions carried on in the Council on some doubt in matter of faith; for, as Cardinal du Perron says, the infallibility of the Pope does not consist in his always receiving at once from the Holy Ghost the necessary light to decide questions of faith, but in his deciding without error in matters in which he feels himself to be sufficiently enlightened by God, while he sends other questions, on which he does not feel himself sufficiently enlightened, to be decided by the Council, *in order that afterwards he may pronounce his own judgment*” (p. 346).

These passages will, we think, show the importance as well as the opportuneness of the republication. It is only necessary to add that the translation seems both accurately and elegantly made, that it is enriched with judicious and learned notes, and that the original Latin of three out of the five treatises which compose the volume, is given in an Appendix.

De Matrimonio B. M. Virginis. Compendio scripsit REV. JACOBUS NARY.
Londini : apud Burns, Oates, et Soc.

WE have only just received a copy of this work, though we fancy it has been out more than a year.

It is refreshing, in these days of newspapers and controversies of the hour, to meet a man who, retired apart from the busy crowd, entertains himself with the masters of Christian thought. Mr. Nary (whose name is not unknown in practical questions also) has been taking a stroll in the fields of theological speculation, and has here put forth his thoughts on the very interesting question which arrested his attention as he went.

The pamphlet consists of three chapters. In the first the reality of our Blessed Lady's marriage with S. Joseph is accurately discussed and firmly established. The second chapter is devoted to the interesting and highly important question, of the compatibility of matrimony with perfect *meutis virginitas*. The third chapter contains a variety of matters belonging to the full elucidation of the question.

The whole essay is evidently the work of a careful reader and a clear thinker; and we hope it will have such a reception, as may encourage its author to cull some more flowers from the same garden.

Theologia de Sanctissimâ Virgine Mariâ. Auctore BOUCARUT, Vicario Generali Reverendissimi Domini Plantier, Episcopi Nemausensis. Editio nova. Nemausi.

THE definition of the Immaculate Conception gave an impetus to the study of our Blessed Lady's prerogatives, which is constantly producing new fruits. Writers on this subject have also given a more marked dogmatical direction to their labours in consequence of the same auspicious event. The great works of Passaglia and Schrader, Ballerini's "*Sylloge Monumentorum*," the works of Mgr. Malou, and others, will at once occur to our readers' recollection in this connection. Notwithstanding the abundance of Marian literature however, the want of a handy text-book of the treatise "*De Beatâ Virgine*" was still felt by students and the parochial clergy. Monsieur l'Abbé Boucarut's small volume is intended to meet this want. The author writes for those theological readers, who are prevented from making themselves acquainted with the larger works on the Blessed Virgin, but who require a book which shall at once feed their own piety and be adapted for the instruction of others. This mutual inter-dependence of devotion and science pervades the whole work; in accordance with that golden saying of Suarez (*De Myst. Vitæ Christi*, in *Præfat.*) which the author makes his own: "*Est enim sine veritate pietas imbecilla, et sine pietate veritas sterilis et jejuna.*" Nor can we describe the work better, than by calling it a compendium of the magnificent treatise just named.

The plan is strictly historical. The scenes of our Blessed Lady's life are set forth in chronological order; and in the light of Holy Scripture and tradition, especially that of the Greek Church. The author has contented himself with proposing to his readers "*Mary in the Gospels*" and in the Church, and leaves them, in great measure, to draw conclusions for themselves. He has carefully distinguished between what is certain and what is probable, and has rigidly confined himself to authentic tradition. He unites with this just sobriety thorough harmony of tone with the true theological conception of Mary, as regards her intimate alliance with her Son's whole work; and may therefore be recommended as a safe and useful guide to preachers and catechists.

A laudatory approbation from the author's diocesan, Mgr. Plantier, is prefixed to the work.

We hope M. Boucarut will not be offended if we remark that his Latin style reads a little oddly. Owing to the absence of connecting particles, a certain monotony of construction is produced, and a *staccato* effect which reminds one of Arnold's Latin exercises.

Directorium Asceticum. By JOHN BAPTIST SCARAMELLI, S.J. Translated and edited at S. Beuno's College, North Wales. Dublin : Kelly.

THE translation of this invaluable work comes to hand at the very last moment, and we can only acknowledge its receipt. We observe that it contains a preface from the Archbishop of Westminster. We hope to notice it carefully in April.

The Pope and the Council. By JANUS. Authorized Translation from the German. Chapter II.—The New Dogma about Mary. London : Rivingtons.

TO treat the subject of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin at all worthily, would have extended our criticism of Janus to an unreasonable length. We have therefore passed over this point altogether in our article ; nor, indeed, is an elaborate argument called for by anything the authors have written. The second chapter—"The New Dogma about Mary"—consists of two pages. Even these have been eked out by the wholly unexpected and unannounced introduction of an attack on the principle of probabilism ; the connection of which with the doctrine of the Assumption is not self-evident.

We hope in our next number to treat the doctrine of our Blessed Lady's Assumption. For the present it will suffice to say, that the truth and definiteness of this pious belief rests : 1st, on a *positive* and *direct* tradition, which reaches back until lost in the origin of the Liturgy ; 2nd, on a *positive* and *indirect* tradition, which can be traced as far as S. Epiphanius (ob. 403) ; 3rd, on *negative* evidence of the highest antiquity, and of the most striking cogency ; 4th, on rigorous theological deduction from other revealed truths ; 5th, on the *sensus fidelium*.

When therefore it is said by Janus (p. 34) that the "earliest authorities" for this tradition are "two apocryphal works of the fourth or fifth century," the statement is only saved from the charge of direct falsehood by an arbitrary and unwarrantable sense of the word "authority" as used in theological and historical investigation, and cannot be saved from the charge of captiousness and extreme shallowness.

Der Papst und das Concil, von Janus. Charakteristik und Würdigung.
Von Dr. M. Jos. SCHEEBEN. Mainz. 1869.

THE anonymous libel of Janus was not likely long to remain unchallenged. Dr. Scheeben of Mayence, has been one of the first to enter the lists against it. In a pamphlet of thirty-six pages, he examines it under the three heads of its dogmatic character, its controversial tactics, and its historical criticism. As to its dogmatic character, he shows that it is at variance with the Catholic faith in the following particulars:—

It denies the supreme authority of general councils under the conditions in which that supreme authority is held as a dogma by the Church. It denies expressly the necessity of the confirmation of councils by the Holy See, and asserts the necessity of the universal consent of the Church to the validity of their decrees. "Neither the dogmatic nor the disciplinary decrees of these councils required Papal confirmation; for their force and authority depended on the consent of the Church as expressed in the Synod, and afterwards in the fact of its being generally received" (p. 78).

It represents the council as only witness, not judge, in questions of faith.

It declares that, in the early ages of the Church, the Popes "possessed none of the three powers which are the proper attributes of sovereignty—neither the legislative, the administrative, nor the judicial" (p. 78); and that all they possessed later, came to them through the tacit or express concession of the Church, often obtained by force and fraud.

It limits the divine institution of the Popedom to a primacy of honour, reviling as "Papalism" the actual constitution of the Church.

Dr. Scheeben does not expressly notice another dogmatic error of Janus,—the assertion in the Preface (xxii.) that the "previously united Church" is now "split up into three great bodies, divided and at enmity with each other."

Under the head of controversial tactics, he points out how Janus follows the tradition of heresy, in pretending to attack only a party which he declares to be the Church's real danger, whilst in fact attacking the Church herself; just as the Reformers professed only to aim their blows against the Roman court and the schoolmen, or the Jansenists against the Jesuits. He notices that it is in so many words "an appeal," not to the hierarchy or the council, but "to the thinkers among believing Christians" (Preface, p. i.)—a phrase which painfully reminds us of the closing number of the "Chronicle" of unhappy memory. He points out also the thoroughly heretical animus, with which the doctrine of the Church and the teaching of "Papalists" is misrepresented and placed in the most odious light.

The largest portion of the pamphlet is taken up with the examination of the historical criticism of Janus. The sum of Dr. Scheeben's testimony is thus expressed:—"We must certainly give credit to the book for the fact

that, as far as we have seen, there is nearly always something in the authorities quoted bearing on the question under discussion. This circumstance shows that the authors have referred to the passages. But it also proves something else. For whilst they are so vehement in reprobating the chroniclers, theologians, and Popes of the middle ages, in spite of their 'want of the historical sense,' as falsifiers of history in the interests of a view, they stamp themselves as forgers every time that they mutilate or distort the contents of their authorities. And how frequently this is the case may be judged of from the circumstance, that it has turned out so in regard to almost every passage which we have casually, as occasion required, referred to. Other readers of the book have made the same observation." We can most fully endorse Dr. Scheeben's judgment from our own experience.

Amongst a number of examples given by Dr. Scheeben, we can only mention here one or two. In the Augsburg "Allgemeine Zeitung," where the book first appeared in the form of letters, were several false statements, shown up in the newspapers, and then dropped out in the permanent work without any explanation or retractation. In the "Pope and the Council," as it now stands, Stephen II. having decided, in a document of doubtful authenticity, that a priest, who in a case of urgency had baptized with wine because water was not procurable, should not be punished for it, Janus relates that this Pope had pronounced *ex cathedra* that such a baptism is valid. He declares that "the inquisitors were delegates of the Pope, and never was a single man borne to the rack or the stake otherwise than by his general or special commission." "The proof," Dr. Scheeben adds, "is naturally not given. . . . Those who have read Hefele's work on Cardinal Ximenes, and who know how even Protestant historians like Ranke have judged the Inquisition, will find it hard to understand how such mischievous untruth should be written in Germany, not by novel-writers, but by Catholic historians,"

Without a shadow of proof again, Eugenius IV. is charged with untruth in the Bull "De Consilio" of December 15th, 1434; and represented as saying that he had confirmed the decree of the second session of the Council, whereas he repeatedly, and the last time with the Council of Florence, solemnly condemned it. But so many similar untruths are being exposed in various quarters, that it is needless to quote further examples. Such an exposure is no doubt as great a necessity in Germany as in England; and we hope Dr. Scheeben's pamphlet may effectually do its work amongst his countrymen.

A Few Specimens of "Scientific History" from "Janus." By EDWARD STEPHEN KEOGH, Priest of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri. London: Longmans. 1870.

F. KEOGH'S "specimens of scientific history from Janus" is as damaging as a short critique can well be. We do not expect to find a book, extolled for its extraordinary learning in reviews like the *North British* and the *Academy*, convicted of twenty or thirty gross errors in matters of fact quite within the reach of the ordinary inquirer. But F. Keogh has done a great deal more than this. He felt, as he tells us, that it would be endless work to notice all the misstatements with which the book abounds; and he has taken care that the specimens he gives should be a real and adequate test of the character of the book. He does not contest matters of detail. He exposes the falsehood of statements, which Janus makes with ludicrous solemnity and regards as decisive against the principles which he attacks.

It is hard to select examples from a pamphlet which is itself composed of specimens; still the quotations which we make will suffice to show that we have not exaggerated the force of F. Keogh's criticism. Janus tells us, p. 91, of all the Fathers who interpret the text, *Tu es Petrus*, "*not a single one* (the italics are those of Janus) *applies it to the Roman bishops as Peter's successors.*" F. Keogh points out that, if this statement were literally true, it would convey a false impression; since there are patristic passages by the dozen which quote our Lord's words to exalt the prerogatives of S. Peter, while others by the dozen call the Pope the successor of S. Peter: and next that S. Augustine, S. Jerome, and a Roman council under Felix II. (485) apply the text in express terms "to the Roman bishops as successors of Peter."

In a picture which Janus draws of the "ancient constitution of the Church," "even if the Pope," he says (p. 80) "had attempted at that time (in the Roman empire) to exercise a formal government over the Church, the thing was a sheer impossibility." "Every church (p. 85) managed its own affairs with perfect freedom and independence." Two facts from a single Pontificate may perhaps induce Janus to modify this view. S. Leo, writing to the Patriarch of Alexandria, "wills" that on great festivals "the oblation of the sacrifice be repeated," to accommodate the increased number of the faithful; and "enacts" (statuit) that in the Patriarchate of Antioch, "none but priests shall presume to preach." After this, nobody will be surprised when Janus makes Gelasius the first to claim for Rome the right of judging every other church; though he may find some difficulty in harmonizing Janus with Socrates, ii. 15:—"When they (Athanasius and the other bishops) had laid their cause before Julius, the Bishop of Rome, he, according to the prerogative of the Roman Church, sent them to the East furnished with very honourable letters, restoring to each of them his See": or with Sozomen, iii. 8:—"The Bishop of Rome having examined the cause of

each, received them into his communion ; and as, on account of the *dignity of his See the case of all belonged to him*, he restored each of them to his Church."

Opponents like F. Keogh are peculiarly galling to the admirers and associates of Janus, for the simple reason that they are unanswerable. Had he gone into the general question of the infallibility of the Holy See ; had he pressed doubtful points, or examined the right of the authors to call themselves Catholics, interest might have been turned aside from the character of the book to questions which cannot be settled within the limits of a pamphlet. As it is, he has done none of these things. He has "fulfilled his task by reference to original authorities, and has not transferred the dispute from the sphere of objective and scientific investigation" (*vide* preface to Janus). He has written with perfect good taste and admirable self-control. Indirectly he has brought forward many facts, which illustrate the strength of patristic testimony to the primacy and infallibility of the Holy See. But his object was to unmask the pretentious mendacity of Janus, and in this he has succeeded.

The Case of Honorius Reconsidered with reference to Recent Apologies.

By PETER LE PAGE RENOUF. London : Longmans.

THIS reply to F. Bottalla and ourselves has reached us at the end of the quarter (Dec. 7), and it is evidently impossible that we can meet it at all points in our present number. We must either, therefore, confine ourselves to a few general comments, or else choose some one particular for complete treatment. For more than one reason, we prefer the latter alternative ; and we will at once give an answer—not so full of course as if we were writing an article, but still (as we consider) absolutely irrefragable—to every single portion of Mr. Renouf's argument, which in any way affects the dogma of Pontifical infallibility. The rest, we need hardly say, is a comparatively small matter, and can well wait till April.* We will begin with two preliminary remarks.

* We must not however delay to correct a stupid mistake of ours, mentioned by Mr. Renouf, occurring however in a note which had no direct bearing on our argument. We cited a sentence of Sergius's letter as "indubitably Monothelistic," which was quoted in reality by that heretical patriarch from S. Gregory Nyssen. We most carelessly understood Sergius's quotation from S. Gregory Nyssen as ending before the sentence which we extracted.

But the substance of our incidental remark is in no way affected by the mistake. It is notorious, that the authors of every fresh heresy have cited incautiously-expressed statements of earlier Fathers, who never dreamed what use would be made of their language. Mr. Renouf will admit, we suppose, that no orthodox Catholic, *after the rise of Monothelism*, would have expressed himself as S. Gregory Nyssen did on this particular occasion. On the very

1. In July, 1868 (p. 204), we stated that "Mr. Renouf gives various indications of holding a theory fundamentally different from the Gallican:" of ascribing infallibility, not to the *Ecclesia Docens*, but to the body of the faithful. Mr. Renouf complains generally of our persistent misapprehensions;* but he has in no way denied this particular allegation, nor expressed any definite doctrine whatever on the "subject" of infallibility. We proceeded to say, that to the best of our belief "no theologian could be found who would not denounce such a tenet as simply heretical"; and even the "Correspondant" (see the last article of our present number) expresses itself in this precise sense. What are we to infer from the fact, that Mr. Renouf has not denied a charge so very distinctly brought?

2. Mr. Renouf speaks (p. 73 et alibi) of our "overbearing and insulting language towards" him. Now, as we pointed out in July 1868 (p. 200), he ascribes to his various opponents—in fact, as F. Bottalla expressed it, to "some of the most eminent writers whom the Catholic Church has produced"—such offences as these: "simple untruth"; "sheer dishonesty"; "interested and mendacious" testimony; "stupid bigotry"; "contemptible quibbling":† and he describes M. Veuillot, in particular, as "a fiery, ignorant, and unscrupulous convert." Is it Mr. Renouf's *opponents*, who "have had recourse to personalities" (p. 3)?‡ Is it in the *opposite* camp to his, that "theological rancour knows no bounds"? No language of ours towards Mr. Renouf can be compared in severity with his language towards his most distinguished opponents; nor is any of it at all unsuitable—such is our deliberate judgment—in dealing with a gentleman who has so expressed himself.

Now then to our argument. There is but one supposition, on which "the case of Honorius" can constitute any objection to the dogma of Pontifical infallibility: viz. the supposition, that Honorius taught heresy or error ex cathedrâ. We are to show therefore, that Mr. Renouf has not adduced so much as the faintest pretext, for affirming that Honorius did so.

question raised by Monothelism, it is most certain that this Father in several passages speaks with most unmistakable distinctness: but to these passages, Sergius makes no reference. Of the particular sentence quoted in our article, Petavius explains the orthodox meaning (*De Incarnatione*, l. 8, c. xiii., n. 8: see also c. i., n. 9): but Sergius's whole context repudiates the notion, that he alleged it in any such sense. As intended by *him*, no sentence in his whole letter is more patently Monothelistic. But we will speak further of this in April.

* Of these, that which he apparently considers most outrageous is one cited by him in a note at p. 94. We really wish our readers would refer to our passage (July 1868, p. 204) after perusing Mr. Renouf's comment. We could desire nothing better.

† This expression (p. 24, note) had every appearance of being applied to F. Perrone's language. We have great pleasure in mentioning, that Mr. Renouf now explains himself (p. 5, note) not to have intended it in this sense. He gives no explanation of the other "overbearing and insulting" expressions quoted in the text.

‡ We are very sorry however, that we referred to Mr. Renouf's youthful pamphlet; as he mentions (p. 3, note) that "its authorship was known to very few persons." Our impression, when we quoted it, was entirely different.

In his first pamphlet (p. 7) our author laid his prominent stress on one particular argument: the judgment of the Sixth Council. "The condemnation for heresy of a Pope . . . is *utterly subversive* of the theory of Papal infallibility, which was elaborated in the sixteenth century." Now "the theory"—or rather the dogma—"of Papal infallibility", as "elaborated in the sixteenth century", is the dogma, that no Pope can teach untruly *ex cathedrâ*. If then Honorius's condemnation be "utterly subversive" of that theory, such condemnation must declare that Honorius taught untruly *ex cathedrâ*. In our replies therefore to Mr. Renouf, we invariably treated this as his fundamental proposition. Now however (p. 4 et alibi) Mr. Renouf repudiates this proposition altogether: he even declares that "no greater anachronism can be committed" than by affirming it; and that, in ascribing it to him, we have displayed our characteristic incapacity for understanding an opponent.* Well, we will not stop to defend our capacity. "The condemnation of Pope Honorius" gave its name to Mr. Renouf's first pamphlet. But he now distinctly explains, that that condemnation does not tell ever so distantly against the Ultramontane dogma, unless a further premiss be assumed; and that a premiss, which all Ultramontanes of the present day as one man peremptorily repudiate. We refer of course to the premiss, that Honorius's Letters were issued *ex cathedrâ*.

Mr. Renouf's argument then on this cardinal question—the question whether Honorius's Letters were *ex cathedrâ*—in no way turns on any decision of the Church, but exclusively on his own personal investigation into the facts of ecclesiastical history. This therefore is the ground on which we are now to meet him. Yet even here it is somewhat difficult to join issue, as we must next proceed to explain.

When Ultramontanes maintain confidently that Honorius's Letters were not issued *ex cathedrâ*, they have a most definite meaning in these last words. They intend to maintain, that Honorius did not issue those Letters with any intention of teaching the whole Church obligatory doctrine. But Mr. Renouf does not himself *allege*, that the Pope issued them with any such intention. "The notion that a Pope," in order to speak *ex cathedrâ*, "must exhibit his intention of binding the interior assent of all Christians, is extremely modern." "If this criterion is necessary, the . . . Popes *never* spoke *ex cathedrâ*" "in the early centuries" (p. 77 and note).† In other words, Mr. Renouf maintains that Popes, in the early centuries, did not consider themselves to possess a power of issuing Constitutions, which should teach all Christians obligatory doctrine. Janus has made a very similar statement;

* As our statement will appear incredible to many readers of the first pamphlet, we append Mr. Renouf's words. "Far from attempting to show that Councils and Popes condemned Honorius for teaching heresy *ex cathedrâ*, I hold that no greater anachronism could be committed" (p. 4). Mr. Renouf is here undoubtedly using the phrase "*ex cathedrâ*" in *his own* sense, on which we presently comment. Yet see p. 23 of his former pamphlet.

† Mr. Renouf does not explain quite clearly in his note, whether he denies that Popes in the early centuries *claimed* to impose such an obligation, or only denies that that claim was *admitted*. We assume him however to mean the former, because the latter would evidently be nothing to the purpose.

and we can only once more (see the last article of our present number) express our blank amazement, that such a thing can possibly have been said. We will confine ourselves here to one instance. When Pope S. Hormisdas required the repentant Acacians, as a condition of communion, to declare that they "received and approved all S. Leo's Letters which he wrote concerning the Christian religion," and to promise that they would "preach all the" dogmatical "Constitutions of the Holy See"—did he, or did he not, consider that those Letters and Constitutions possessed an obligatory force on the assent of Catholics? There is but one answer possible. What *proof* does Mr. Renouf advance, for that truly bewildering statement of his, which is simply the one indispensable foundation of his whole argument? Absolutely none whatever. He does not give one quarter of a page, out of his hundred pages, to a defence of this particular paradox; nor does he attempt to meet the repeated instances, contradicting his view, which are to be found in every chapter of Orsi and Muzzarelli.

Let us put his argument then into shape. Ultramontanes—when laying down that all *ex cathedrâ* Acts are infallible—define an *ex cathedrâ* Act as an Act, in which the Pope purports to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine.* Mr. Renouf demurs to this definition. He objects firstly, that, if it be correct, there were no *ex cathedrâ* Acts *at all* in the early centuries: and on this objection we need say no more. Secondly, Mr. Renouf asks a very singular question, which we will state in his own words:—

"If the Pope, for instance, after consulting the most learned and pious bishops of the Church with reference to an existing controversy, were to publish an Encyclical announcing his intention of speaking as Universal Teacher;—and after laying down the limits of the Christian Faith upon the subject, were to declare most solemnly that each of the contending parties might lawfully hold and teach his own opinion;—on what ground would Dr. Ward deny that such an utterance was *ex cathedrâ*?" (p. 89).

Mr. Renouf puts the question so very strangely, as sufficiently to show how little he has mastered the meaning of Ultramontanes: for of course, if the Pope speaks as Universal Teacher, he speaks *ex cathedrâ*. By so speaking in the supposed case, he imposes on all Catholics an obligation of holding with irreformable assent, (1) that "the limits of the Christian Faith on the subject" are those which he has laid down; and (2) that *neither* contending party contradicts obligatory Catholic doctrine. Where is the difficulty?

Mr. Renouf himself then uses the phrase "*ex cathedrâ*" as pretty nearly synonymous with "official": and in July 1868 we freely admitted to him (p. 210), that Honorius's Letters *were* "official." Nor, we are convinced, did those theologians dream of denying this, whom he quotes in pp. 71, 72: they used the expression "*privatus doctor*," simply as contradictory to "*loquens ex cathedrâ*." Roncaglia, e. g., as quoted by Mr. Renouf himself, says) "*Honorius failed, as a private doctor, in the office of confirming his brethren*": i. e. (by the very force of terms) that his Act was *official*, though

* Dr. Murray, alone (we fancy) among Ultramontanes, uses the word "*ex cathedrâ*" to signify "official." His *doctrine*, we need hardly say, is precisely the same with our own.

not *ex cathedrâ*. This is the conclusion which we are ourselves now to demonstrate. A very large number of Apostolic Letters were issued by Popes of that period, with a view of teaching the whole Church obligatory doctrine. We are to show that neither of Honorius's Letters can possibly have belonged to that class. This conclusion rests both on intrinsic and on extrinsic evidence; and we have always dwelt predominantly on the former. We will commence however with the latter.

The extrinsic argument on which we have ourselves laid the greatest stress, is the absence of publication or circulation.* The expressing some doctrine in some Letter to an individual bishop, is in itself evidently quite a different thing from declaring it *obligatory on all Catholics*. In order therefore that any such Letter be accounted *ex cathedrâ*, some token is required, which shall indicate the Pope's intention of obliging the whole Catholic world to interior assent. Accordingly, as Mr. Renouf admits (p. 80), "S. Leo took great pains in *circulating* his" *ex cathedrâ* "Letter through the Church": whereas, Honorius's Letter, as F. Bottalla puts it, "remained buried in the archives of the Church of Constantinople." Our opponents have to maintain, that Honorius in those Letters intended to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine. How then can they possibly explain the above-mentioned fact? If he in-

* Mr. Renouf (pp. 73-78) puts together in his own support a very large number of extracts from Dr. Ward's writings. Of these there are but three, which have the most superficial appearance of divergence from what is said in the text; and these are explained in a moment. As to that in p. 74 line 6, —Dr. Ward avowedly calls no other Apostolic Letters "doctrinal," except those whose *direct purpose* it is to teach doctrine: as distinguished e.g. from instances, in which doctrinal *reasons* are assigned for some disciplinary decision. Then an opinion (p. 75) is ascribed, on F. Coninck's authority, to a large number of theologians: but so far was it from being *Dr. Ward's* opinion, that he cited it for the very purpose of showing how far beyond himself many theologians have proceeded. See our number for October 1867, p. 488. "Suarez," with Coninck in his company, "goes greater lengths on the extent of infallibility than we are prepared to follow." Lastly, the phrase (cited at the top of p. 75) —"authoritatively pronounce a tenet unsound,"—is at once explained by its context and by its reference to Dr. Murray. The Pope is said by Dr. Ward "authoritatively to pronounce a tenet unsound,"—either when he officially brands it with a theological censure; or else when he officially in so many words pronounces its contradictory to be "revealed," "certain," &c.

One further explanation is necessary, in regard to the theologians cited by Coninck. These do not dream of holding that the Pope can speak infallibly, when he is not intending to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine; but they think that he sufficiently *manifests* that intention, by the mere fact of officially answering a doctrinal question. Even from this view, it would not follow that Honorius taught *ex cathedrâ*; because (as we prove in the text) the question which he answered was not doctrinal but disciplinary. But let us suppose otherwise for argument's sake: let us suppose that Coninck's view involved the conclusion, that Honorius's Letters were issued *ex cathedrâ*. Such a fact would have no *tendency* to show that they were issued *ex cathedrâ*: it would only show that Coninck's view is mistaken. The facts we bring together in the text demonstrate it to be simply among the most certain and undeniable facts in the whole world, that Honorius did *not* intend to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine.

tended to bind the whole Church, why did he take no single step to acquaint the Westerns with what he had done?

Nay further. Almost all Honorius's opponents maintain, that the doctrine taught by him to the whole Church, was neither more nor less than the Monothelistic heresy. Yet consider. The whole Western Church was Duothelistic. On the hypothesis before us, he was intending to condemn Duothelism as a soul-destroying error; and yet he never *manifested* such intention, even to his own most Duothelistic diocese! His immediate flock persisted in what their pastor accounted heresy: and that pastor—zealous for purity of Faith in the patriarchates of Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem—had no syllable of warning for those of his own household. One who could believe this, could believe anything.

But now for the intrinsic evidence. If Honorius taught in his Letters any untrue doctrine *ex cathedrâ*, it must have been either by pronouncing heretically on *dogma*, or by pronouncing mistakenly on the due *expression* of dogma. We will take both suppositions successively; and first inquire whether, as Universal Teacher, he enforced Monothelism.

In January last (pp. 199-202) we printed at length Honorius's first Letter, and also the extant remains of his second. The one thing which on the surface will strike every reader is, that his pronouncements on *dogma* are entirely ministrative and subordinate to his pronouncements on *phraseology*. We are not as yet inquiring, whether the pronouncements on phraseology are doctrinal or disciplinary: we are only saying, that they obviously compose the pith and drift of the Letters. However, we must go into the thing more fully.

If Honorius taught Monothelism *ex cathedrâ*, he did so by obliging all Catholics to hold, either (1) that in Christ there is but one energy, or else (2) that in Christ there is but one will. Did he command Catholics then to hold, that in Christ there is but one energy? So far from it, that the direct purpose of his Letters was to prohibit or dissuade Easterns from using the phrase *at all*: on the very ground, that it was an inexpedient expression of Catholic dogma.

Was he then commanding Catholics to hold, that in Christ there is but one *will*? Such a supposition is almost as singular as the former. The question which he was asked, concerned exclusively the "one energy": and if ever there were an obiter dictum in the world, such was his declaration concerning our Lord's one will.* On the contrary supposition, his Letters must be analyzed in some such sense as this. "In reply to your question, I earnestly exhort you not to say, either that in Christ there are two energies, or that in Christ there is only one energy. But (by the way) I take this opportunity of answering *another* question, which *no one* has asked me; of commanding you and all Catholics to believe, with divine faith, that in Him there is only one will. You must never say that there is only one energy; yet you must firmly believe and loudly profess that there is only one will." Whoever

* We are firmly convinced, of course, that his declaration on this matter was perfectly orthodox; but we have no right to assume this in our present argument.

can read Honorius's Letters and be satisfied with this analysis, is far beyond the reach of any argument we can adduce.

Mr. Renouf himself is not, of course, responsible for this particular paradox : because he admits that Honorius was not purporting to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine. Yet even such a version as *he* must give of the Letters, is most curious. And there is one further circumstance, which is simply final and conclusive. Mr. Renouf urges (p. 27), that when Honorius wrote his second Letter, he had been thoroughly informed by S. Sophronius's envoys on the whole facts of the controversy ; and at all events the Pope most indubitably knew, that that patriarch earnestly repudiated Monothelism. If then, as Mr. Renouf thinks, Honorius had in his first Letter authoritatively taught Monothelism as the revealed dogma, Sophronius in the Pope's eyes must have been neither more nor less than a condemned heretic ; not only no Catholic bishop, but not even a Catholic. Yet in his second Letter Honorius calls Sophronius a "brother and fellow-bishop" : and (which is still more preemptorily decisive) speaks of the Saint's envoys as having made the whole submission which he (the Pope) desired at their hand, when they *conditionally* promised that their patriarch should no longer use the *expression* about Christ's "two energies." As to any retraction of the Duothelistic *dogma*, it is not so much as distantly hinted at.

In fact the only mistaken definition which can be ascribed to Honorius without simple absurdity, concerns, not the dogma, but its expression. It may be contended that Honorius taught *ex cathedrâ* the doctrine, that either of those two phrases—"one energy," "two energies,"—is an inappropriate expression of the revealed verity. But, as it oddly happens, the last sentence of the second Letter is as simply fatal to any such supposition, as though Honorius had presaged the future controversy and had resolved to make all misconception impossible. S. Sophronius's envoys promised that their patriarch would abstain from the phrase "two energies," if Cyrus would only abstain from the phrase "one energy" : and with this promise Honorius declared himself abundantly satisfied. On the view which we are opposing, Honorius had commanded Sophronius, Cyrus, and all other Catholics, to hold with *irreformable interior assent*, that the two phrases are both of them inappropriate. Yet what are the facts ? So far from *commanding* them to hold any such *doctrine*, he did not even *ask* them to form any such *opinion*. All he desired was external conformity ; and he obtained his full purpose, as soon as that external conformity was secured. The whole proceeding was disciplinary, not doctrinal, from beginning to end.

As a last resource it may be alleged, that Honorius imposed an obligation of holding, that Sergius's and Cyrus's denial of the "two energies" was no denial of revealed truth. But there is not the remotest trace of any attempt on Honorius's part to enforce such an obligation on S. Sophronius. Indeed we must never forget that, by Mr. Renouf's own admission, Honorius imposed no obligation whatever on the interior assent of Catholics.

If the phrase *ex cathedrâ* then be understood in that sense, in which alone Ultramontanes ascribe infallibility to *ex cathedrâ* Acts, we confidently draw this inference from what has preceded. We do not see how it is more certain that Pope Honorius ever lived, than that his Letters do not teach *ex cathedrâ* either heresy or error.

These Letters then, we have now seen, do not present even a momentary or superficial difficulty, against the dogma of Pontifical infallibility. But it is not a little remarkable that, even on Mr. Renouf's own showing, they present no difficulty whatever against a further pious opinion, which is held by various theologians as more or less probable. We refer to the opinion, that God will never permit a Pope, even personally, to be a formal heretic. Mr. Renouf only alleges, that Honorius "was at least *materially* heretical" (p. 11). On the other hand, all Ultramontanes firmly hold that he so grievously failed in resisting Monothelism, as to deserve S. Leo II.'s infallibly pronounced anathema. The only remaining question therefore is, whether this failure consisted (as we maintain) in his not taking due pains to ascertain Sergius's true doctrine; or whether it consisted (as Mr. Renouf maintains) in being himself bitten by that doctrine, before "discovering that the sense of the Church was decidedly opposed to it" (p. 11). On this comparatively small issue we are to encounter Mr. Renouf in April. We shall have little difficulty in the task. We have now replied to that gentleman's third thesis; and the reasoning adduced by him for his two former is so weak, that we are a good deal surprised it has been satisfactory even to himself. His statements are mutually contradictory, even on the fundamental question, what constitutes the Monothelite heresy? And as to his arguments, their only appearance of strength lies in the confidence with which they are expressed.

With one more word we conclude for the present. Mr. Renouf's first pamphlet was placed on the Index. We should have been glad to hear from him what measures he has taken, to ascertain the particular errors for which it was condemned, and to avoid those errors in future. It seems to us, that his profound silence on the subject exhibits intolerable disrespect to authority.

The Roman Index and its Proceedings.

Is the Western Church under an Anathema? By E. S. FFOULKES.
London: Hayes.

MR. FFOULKES, having now been refused the sacraments in consequence of his former pamphlet, has so greatly lost his power of injuring the Church, that we need only give these pamphlets very slight notice. There are two particulars however, on which we are personally appealed to for an explanation, and which we will successively consider.

Mr. Ffoulkes protests against "the rude personal attacks" of F. Ryder and ourselves. So far as we are concerned, our reason for speaking in the tone we did is simply this:—When Mr. Ffoulkes wrote his pamphlet, either he did or did not believe, that the Roman Catholic Church is appointed by God as man's one infallible guide to virtue, sanctification, and salvation. If he did *not* believe this, he was simply in the position

of a "traitor in the camp"; of a Frenchman or Russian, fighting against England in English uniform. If he *did* believe the truth we have mentioned, it is difficult to imagine a more grievous offence, than his doing everything he possibly could, that men should think all manner of *evil* against that society, which (as he well knew) God has given them as their infallible guide to virtue, sanctification, and salvation. We hardly know which alternative is more discreditable to Mr. Ffoulkes: but in either case it was our duty, as we conceive, to exhibit, without disguise or extenuation, the various moral and intellectual defects, which we considered his writings prominently to exhibit. We look back with gratification on the fact of our having done so; but we have never had a particle of personal feeling in the whole matter.

Mr. Ffoulkes says, in his second pamphlet (p. 28), that a certain sentence, which we quoted in April (p. 285, note) as from S. Hormisdas, is of most suspicious genuineness; and that it is marked accordingly in every printed edition of that Pontiff's Letters, which Mr. Ffoulkes has seen. As a matter of fact, we believe there is no doubt whatever of its genuineness: but clearly, if we had had any reason to suspect that such a doubt had been expressed, it was very dishonest in us not to mention the circumstance. We had no reason whatever for such suspicion. Our own reference was taken from Colet's edition of Labbe: *there* no such doubt is mentioned. A learned friend tells us that the same is true concerning Harduin's collection.

In fairness at once to Mr. Ffoulkes and to the cause of truth, we here print an explanation of his intended doctrine, to which he still adheres:—

"Having learnt from my bishop that a pamphlet lately published by me, entitled 'The Church's Creed or the Crown's Creed?', has been examined, and pronounced by him to be heretical, I desire hereby to submit myself to that judgment, and to express my sorrow that I should in anything have erred from the holy Catholic and Apostolic faith.

"Although I trust I have not intentionally erred from the truth, nor wilfully opposed myself to the divine authority of the Church, nevertheless I am well aware how easily I may have done so.

"I therefore hereby, without reserve, retract all and everything that I have written, there or elsewhere, which is contrary to what the Church has defined as of faith.

"Having learnt also from him that scandal, offence, and pain has been given by my writings, and especially by the pamphlet above-named, to the faithful, and that the same pamphlet has been used by those that are separate from the Catholic and Roman Church as an excuse or argument for not submitting to its divine authority, I hereby desire to explain myself categorically on two points in particular, the most likely to have caused such results of any that occur to me, from not having been brought out as prominently there as they might have been, but on which it never was my intention that my meaning should be ambiguous.

"1. Whatever I may or may not have been called upon to profess fourteen years ago myself, I nevertheless believe, and believe heartily, in the inerrancy, by perpetual assistance of the Holy Ghost in all ages, of the one Catholic Church in communion with the Pope, and of which the Pope is head by divine right, 'in fidei ac morum disciplinâ tradendâ,' as the Cate-

chism of the Council of Trent teaches. And, 2, as regards matter of fact, my own personal investigations enable me to affirm the verdict of history to be, that the See of Rome, as such, has been preserved in all ages from upholding or embracing heresy. I say this more particularly with reference to the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost, on which I fear my meaning may have been misapprehended.

"Therefore, negatively, should I have ever seemed to say or imply the contrary to what I have just affirmed, or else to say or imply that the true Church has ever ceased, or can ever cease, to be one visibly, or that the See of Rome was not constituted its centre of unity upon earth, so that communion with the one should be the indispensable condition of participating in the unity of the other,—I hereby declare my heartfelt sorrow at having, in any of my writings, so expressed myself on these points as to have offended any or misled any by seeming to say or imply, in language injurious to the Holy See, what I never meant to assert and hereby repudiate" ("The Roman Index, &c.," pp. 34, 35).

We trust that Mr. Ffoulkes's non-Catholic admirers will remember that this is the authentic exposition of his opinions. For ourselves, we cannot but cherish the hope that he will before long carry forward the principles here laid down to their legitimate issue, and will make an honourable act of retraction and submission.

Separation not Schism. By G. F. COBB, M.A. London: Palmer.

WHATEVER Mr. Cobb writes deserves a careful hearing from Catholics, because of the author's singular candour and temperance. Moreover this pamphlet has one charm for us, as singularly reminding us of the view elaborated, some twenty-five years ago, in a volume called "The Ideal of a Christian Church," which Mr. Cobb probably never opened. We have been much disappointed in not having time to notice Mr. Cobb as he deserves this quarter; but hope to do so without fail in our April number.

The Visible Unity of the Catholic Church. By M. J. RHODES, M.A.
London: Longmans.

WE have just received most of the proof-sheets of this admirable work: which will not however be out until about the middle of January. We will give it a careful notice in our next number. Here we will only say that it is written against Anglicans in general and against Dr. Pusey in particular; that it is at once most temperately and most closely argued; that it is very highly praised by Mr. Rhodes's late diocesan, the Bishop of Cork, who warmly encouraged the whole undertaking; and that, in addition to the general theological censorship which the whole has received, F. Cardella, S.J., of the "Civiltà," has examined with particular care those portions which are more distinctly dogmatic.

Union with Rome. Five Afternoon Lectures preached in the Church of the Immaculate Conception, Farm Street, by the Rev. ALBANY CHRISTIE, of the Society of Jesus. Burns, Oates, & Co.

WE have here a series of calm, clear arguments upon the position assumed by Ritualistic Anglicans in the present day. The first sermon states, with unusual fairness, the argument that each diocese is a separate Church, and that individuals are not bound, and therefore not allowed, to leave it; shows that the real point at issue is "independence or dependence"; and states the Catholic doctrine that one Head, upon whom all were to depend, was appointed by our Lord. The second gives the arguments to prove that the visible Church must have a visible Head; and that if, as is shown, the existence of such a Head is *à priori* probable (i.e., that its necessity may be inferred on grounds admitted alike by Anglicans and by Catholics), then it is unreasonable to explain away texts which seem to refer to it, and which yet by themselves might bear another interpretation. We do not remember to have seen this drawn out; and yet we are sure the real reason why religious men among Protestants of whatever class explain away such texts as those recording the charge of our Blessed Lord to S. Peter, or, again, His solemn words upon the Real Presence in the sixth chapter of S. John's Gospel, for instance, or at the Last Supper, is, that the conclusion seems to them strange and startling, because they have been taught from their childhood that it is incredible and unreasonable; while, on the other hand, they are familiar with the words, and therefore have become so thoroughly accustomed to a different interpretation, that by long habit it seems to them the only natural one, and all others forced and improbable. We are confident that on this account religious Protestants are less sensible of the real force of texts with which they have been familiar from their infancy, than others to whom the Scriptures are more new. On the other hand, Catholics, who have learned at an age to which their memory does not extend both the doctrine and the text in which it is mentioned, cannot see how an honest man can put upon it any other interpretation. This, we are certain, is one of the main reasons why persons brought up in widely different religious schools find it almost impossible to believe each other to be in good faith; and why we continually find irreligious men who are not anxiously concerned to receive the words of our Divine Master as He would have them received, or unbelievers who attach to them no importance at all, ready to admit that Catholic doctrine is distinctly expressed in them: while multitudes of well-meaning religious men are indignant at what they regard as a forced interpretation of them—that is, at one quite different from what they have been brought up to believe to be their meaning.

The third sermon answers the Tractarian view, that external union, although the normal state of the Christian Church, has been forfeited by the sins of Christians: showing that the promise of perpetual unity is, from its nature.

one of those which are unconditional. The fourth answers very effectively what we know to be one of the main difficulties of Anglicans as to the authority of the Holy See ; *i.e.*, that although given by our Blessed Lord to S. Peter, yet, in practice, it was gradually developed. The fifth shows that it is the duty of individuals to make their own submission at once, without waiting for the realization of the phantom of "corporate union." In this, F. Christie well draws out the reasons why it is impossible (to take one example) that the Holy See should concede communion under both kinds to Anglicans, although it was conceded in the sixteenth century to the Maronites. Anglicans desire it "on principles of heresy, the Maronites possessed it by time-honoured tradition." In England the demand arose because, after the Communion under one kind had long been the practice of the Western Church, "innovators arose who asserted that communion under one kind was a mutilated sacrament, that Christ was not received whole and entire under each kind, and therefore that communion under both kinds was necessary." To concede this demand therefore, would be to endorse heretical teaching.

Father Christie shows (what to Catholics is so clear that one is almost provoked it should be needful to show it), that "corporate reunion," in the sense intended by the Ritualistic leaders, is impossible on the side of the Church ; what we think more important is that he shows, even more forcibly, its impossibility on the Anglican side. Nothing is more certain than that those members of the Established Church who really desire reunion are only a sprinkling, and that the great majority would not merely regret the only terms on which the Church could allow it, but would regard it in itself, apart from all consideration of those terms, an evil, not a good. But F. Christie very well puts it to the Unionists, that with their feelings about the Anglican Bishops, they can hardly wish that they should be admitted as Bishops of the Catholic Church, even if it were possible that the Church should be willing to admit them. Assuredly not. They are well selected for the office to which they aspired, and to which they were appointed—to be the chiefs of a respectable profession, dignified members of the Civil Service, as Lord Houghton well called them ; but as Catholic Bishops they would feel themselves, and be felt by others, to be much more out of their place, than if they were suddenly called to command a brigade of Guards. The only point on which we do not agree with F. Christie is his opinion that the next generation of Anglican clergy is not likely to be affected by the Catholic movement. We may be mistaken, for, of all gifts, anticipation of what is to come is least granted to man ; but, as far as present indications enable us to judge, we cannot but believe that there is likely to be a very strong body of men with even less remnant of positive faith (difficult as that seems to imagine) than the "broad" party of the present generation ; but that of those who retain any belief in Christianity, as the term has in times past been understood even among Protestants, very nearly, if not quite all, are likely enough to ever be nearer to the Catholic Church than most of the present Unionist party. If we are not mistaken, F. Christie is led to a different conclusion by a miscalculation, not unnatural in one who was so important a member of the "Puseyite" movement in Oxford, when he thinks

that owing to the want of such men as Newman and his coadjutors among the fellows and tutors in Oxford, a generation of clergy must be sent out into the world who will be less inclined to wish for reunion. He seems to us to underestimate the united action of a great number of causes, of which the rise of the Tractarian school in Oxford, though perhaps the most important, was only one : and many of the others are surely in more active operation than ever.

How great a change has already been effected in the religious tone of the more thinking classes in England, the very sermons before us are a striking proof. F. Christie is a keen observer, placed in a position which enables him to judge of this better than most men ; and he has given us a series of sermons, hardly a word of which would have been intelligible to the educated Protestants of thirty years back. The objections he answers, the data he assumes, the hopes, wishes, and fears he imputes to his audience, would alike have seemed a dream. Who can say what England will be thirty years hence, if during that time the progress of men's thoughts and convictions be as great, and in the same direction, that it has been during those which have just passed by ? But upon this it is vain to dwell, for the present, not the future, is ours.

Galway Academical Papers. Published for S. Ignatius College, Galway.

Part I. The Public Academy of Christmas, 1868, "On the Spirit of a Language." Part II. The Public Academy of Shrovetide, 1869, "On the Oratory of Demosthenes." Dublin : Kelly, 8, Grafton Street.

WE have read with interest these two pamphlets, which together only cost eightpence. They bear strong marks of really being what they profess to be, the exercises of boys of the higher classes of a Catholic college, defending different views of the subjects which their year's studies have brought before them. The plan itself is an excellent one, as leading boys not merely to construe their author, but to think about what he says ; and the execution is highly creditable, both to the boys and the college. It shows, for instance, that the attention of the boys who were reading Demosthenes had been called to the criticisms upon him made by Lord Brougham and Grote. The spirit of a language, again, was a happy subject among boys of their age, in these Western lands, in which the study of foreign languages has always been the chief instrument of education. This discussion ends with a graceful tribute to the Bishop of Galway and the rector of the Catholic University of Ireland, before whom it was held :—"You have not come here to-day to receive instruction from schoolboys. You have come that you may see and encourage our efforts to become what you have so long been, to follow the example you have given us, to become acquainted with what men should know, in order to be able to do what men should do." A notice is prefixed that the speeches were *bonâ fide* "prepared for oral delivery," and that they are generally published as they were delivered.

Discourses on some Parables of the New Testament. By C. B. GARSIDE, M.A.
London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

IN our last number we gave some account of Mr. Garside's treatment of the Parable of the Prodigal Son. The volume also contains those of "the Sower," and "the Ten Virgins." The Sower is treated in five sermons. In the first Mr. Garside considers the Person and office of the Sower, our Divine Lord and Saviour; in the second the "wayside," on which the seed is sown; in the third "the birds of the air," which devour it; in the fourth the stony ground; in the fifth the ground in which lay hid the seed of "the thorns." We have been struck in these with the same merit which we pointed out in our author's treatment of "the Prodigal Son": that is, that the sermons are strictly practical, pointing out actual dangers, actual temptations, and actual duties; and yet the Parable is not merely put as a sort of motto to introduce the thoughts of the preacher, but, after reading the sermon, we feel that we understand the meaning of the Parable better than we did. We have always been inclined to think that it would be well if custom did not so imperatively require that a sermon should have a text. Sermons are clearly of two kinds; one which explains a text of Scripture—one which develops some thought which the preacher wishes to enforce or explain. The latter we have known an author thoughtfully compose with much labour, and then remember that he had to find for it an appropriate text. In such cases it would perhaps be better, and especially it would be a more reverent treatment of Holy Scripture not to put a text before it at all. There are preachers (Father Faber was a notable instance) who are not afraid of this. How often have we seen him mount the steps of the pulpit of the Oratory, and begin his sermon without any preface except the sign of the Cross and the invocation of the Holy Names. But there are not very many who venture to follow his example; and then it sometimes happens that a sermon in itself full of thought and instruction has no real connection with the text prefixed to it. The other class is that in which the preacher takes a difficult text to explain its context and meaning, or one peculiarly striking to enforce its lessons. This class is, no doubt, specially suitable to England in controversial addresses; because the poor have generally been taught to place so large a part of their religion in studying the letter of the Holy Scriptures, and are very often so wholly ignorant of their meaning. For instance, how many believe that the Calvinistic system is taught in S. Paul's Epistles, really because they have received from their earliest childhood a "tradition of men," which told them that Calvin's doctrine was what S. Paul meant to teach, in isolated texts the meaning of which would be clear if considered in their context. But these commentaries are hardly sermons. The characteristic of Mr. Garside's sermons is that, while not thus running into commentaries, they do so much explain the Parable that a man can hardly read, and can hardly have heard them with attention, without feeling that he knows its meaning better than he did before, and

(what is far more important) without taking with him the recollection of some important lesson so much connected with its words, that he can hardly hear them again without the thought of it coming back into his mind. Such, for instance, is the third sermon of this series, in which the "birds of the air," that steal away the seed, are explained to be "evil thoughts," which come in flights to carry away the seed, buried in the mind by the Divine Sower. After explaining how thoughts may come into the mind without sin, and that there are "birds of the air," which fly near to but do not eat up the good seed, Mr. Garside continues :—

"Nevertheless, whilst we make every proper and just distinction, and whilst we fully admit that we must not confound temptation with sin, and vividness of imagination with real consent, there still remains the fact that genuine sins of thought *are* committed by Christians with a frequency and intensity of guilt of which God alone knows the full measure. They are committed by the young, in the first gambols of their ever active fancy ; in whom also curiosity has the force of a passion, inciting them to indulge in thoughts about sins, which as yet, perhaps, they have not dared to carry out into action. They are committed by the old, in whom a guilty course during their earlier years has planted the sad habit of a polluted imagination, which seems to taint with unhallowed associations everything that passes through its gates. There is no class, no sex, no age, free from the danger ; there is no place where evil thoughts will not try to intrude : before the Holy Tabernacle, and in the very act of Communion, it is possible for them to be entertained. We know too well that souls have perished when within an inch of eternity. Men in the face of imminent death, with a distinct knowledge that in another hour they must stand naked before their God, thus hanging by a hair over the great abyss, have deliberately consented to an evil thought, and been therefore carried away into instant damnation" (p. 173).

The fifth sermon, on "Three Enemies of the Soul," strikes us as especially good.

It is curious to compare these sermons with those of Protestant preachers, with whom this parable is decidedly a favourite subject. We doubt whether there is any one of them who does not consider that "the Sower" is "the preacher," and "the word" his sermons. To a Catholic it seems quite natural that "the Sower" should be, as Mr. Garside says, the Incarnate Son, and the Seed the Divine truth ; that is, first Himself, and then His Gospel. This is, in truth, only one example of what we everywhere see, how in Protestant systems, even though they are the systems of good and earnest men, man and nature are in truth everything ; in the one Catholic system God is all in all.

The three sermons on the parable of the wise and foolish virgins are headed, "The Dignity and Responsibility of the Christian ;" "Naturalism and Unreality ;" and "Preparation and Presumption." We have left ourselves little room to speak of them. On the whole, we think them the most interesting in the volume. We will content ourselves with one short extract. Mr. Garside considers the sleep from which both wise and foolish were suddenly awakened by the cry which announced the near approach of the bridegroom, to be death ; the time when they had waited before they fell asleep to be this life ; and hence he derives a definition of this life—it is

"the tarrying of the Bridegroom, the Lord Jesus Christ." And then, speaking of the shortness of this time, and the sudden and unexpected termination of it, he remarks, what we think must have struck all whose duties have called them to attend on the dying :—

"Even after long illnesses it may be said that death comes on a sudden. Men become used to sickness. They are often so completely engrossed with their wants, so distracted with their pains, so eager to watch the signs of improvement, so pleased with the affectionate attentions of their friends, that at length the idea of death almost passes away. They have been so long ill, that they have forgotten that this state cannot last for ever : hence they are startled, bewildered, and incredulous when a friendly voice says to them, in the midst of tears, 'Prepare to die, for ye cannot survive the night.'

I was once called to visit a sick man, and I saw at a glimpse that his spirit would soon pass away. I heard the echo of the midnight cry in the distance, but he did not. He looked me full in the face, and said, 'Why do you think I am dying? If you would give me a cordial I should live for years. I do not believe that I am going.' I exhorted him to prepare for the last ; but, finding I could not convince him of his nearness to death, and he only grew more excited, I left him for a little while, that he might think quietly upon my words. When I returned he was already before his Maker. The cry had arrived whilst I was absent : 'Behold the Bridegroom cometh ; go thou forth to meet him.' And he had gone."

The Church of England Communion Service : its Nullity and Profanity.
By PELAGIUS, Patriarch of the British Church, Archbishop of
Carleon, &c., &c. London. No publisher. Printed by Spottiswoode.
1869.

TRUTH enforces from us the confession—very unusual in a journalist—that this shilling pamphlet fairly puzzles us. We have no guess who Pelagius may be, what opinions or school he represents, or what can be the object of his pamphlet. It is not his dignity which puzzles us,

"For we are now no niggards of respect
To merit's unauthenticated forms."

Time was, indeed, when it used to be taken for granted that a man could attain to high dignities only by the grant of some one higher than himself. The King used to be "the fountain of honour" in the State, and in the Church the King of kings. But "*nous avons changé tout cela.*" Henry and Elizabeth first took upon themselves to be the fountain of spiritual as well as temporal dignities and jurisdictions, and by a just as well as natural consequence, the truth has long been understood, that what they conferred upon their creatures each man might with equal validity confer upon himself. We have now a gentleman, this instant we forget his name, who by his own grace and favour has been made "Bishop of Iona," and Mr. Lyne has

appointed himself Father Ignatius, Abbot and Superior of the Benedictine Order, and invested himself with the power of excommunicating. We freely admit that both of these gentlemen have quite as much spiritual jurisdiction as the excellent Dr. Tait. Why then should not some other old friend have given himself the name of Pelagius, and the dignity of Archbishop and Patriarch, although we have not been so fortunate as to hear of it. Indeed, the fashion has lately been extending to temporal as well as spiritual dignities. Mr. Bugg has dispensed with the Queen's letters patent, and made himself Norfolk Howard; and a lady, equally excellent no doubt, though we have not the honour of her acquaintance, has created herself "Countess of Derwentwater." We have not yet heard, but it is quite possible that she has raised herself to yet higher dignities. Pelagius then may be some well-known clergyman or layman. But what fairly puzzles us is, his object. We see what he denounces; but what is it that he wishes us to accept? Our first impression was that the writer was some Catholic, exposing, under a feigned name, the unquestionable fact that the Established Church is, on its own principles, merely a heretical body. But we soon came to passages in which he speaks of the one Church of God in terms which no Catholic could allow himself to use even under an assumed character. Since we gave up this theory we have been reminded of the Nonjurors in the last century, some of whom maintained that all the Churches, sects, and bishops in Christendom, Catholics and Protestants alike, were heretics and schismatics except themselves: meaning by "themselves," not even the body of the Nonjurors, small as that was, but one or two gentlemen who had separated themselves from that body. This is, to say the truth, very much the tone of the pamphlet before us, and in this way it so strikingly illustrates the natural and legitimate working out of Anglican principles, that we should still be inclined to think that was the object with which it was written, if we could in any way get over the difficulty we have already mentioned. As it is, we venture to think that there must have been a new Church set up within the last few days, of the existence of which we have not yet happened to hear. We would suggest whether it is not possible that of this new Church, Pelagius (by whatever name men may hitherto have called him) may be (we do not mean represent) the whole clergy of all grades, and Mr. Ffoulkes the whole laity. We have heard nothing to bear out this theory; but it has been suggested by finding that Pelagius has adopted Mr. Ffoulkes's crotchet, about the sacred words in the creed relating to the procession of the Eternal Spirit. However this may be, we can recommend the tract before us as illustrating the natural, logical, and inevitable effects of taking for granted the first principle of Anglicanism, which was accepted by the Nonjurors whom we have already mentioned, and by poor Mr. Ffoulkes. That principle is, that the Church in primitive times had authority to define points of faith, and actually used that power; but that in the nineteenth century it has no such power, and that each individual Christian is allowed, and therefore bound, to examine for himself the history of the primitive Church, for the purpose of deciding what his creed ought to be. Of course this, no less than the maxim, "the Bible and the Bible alone," makes the private judgment of each individual

the ultimate rule of faith. For, however he may hold (with the Nonjurors) that all men are bound to "keep whole and undefiled the Catholic Faith," yet he is obliged to ascertain what that Faith is by his individual studies and his private judgment, as there is no Church existing at this day whose teaching he is bound to accept. If it was the object of the writer to illustrate this truth, he has fully succeeded; if not, we have no theory to suggest which will explain what it was.

The Religion of Common Sense. By HENRY JOHN PYE, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Burns & Oates. 1870.

THIS is a remarkably logical and forcible statement of the grounds on which any man who admits Christianity is bound in common sense to submit to the Catholic Church. It is a very strong testimony to the power with which this is done, that we have read it through from beginning to end without finding ourselves at all tempted to be weary of it; for though men may, and often do, like to hear what they believe boldly stated by another, it is not at all the case that they always like to trouble themselves with reading the arguments by which another supports it. As a general rule, it is the reverse.

Mr. Pye begins by a curious anecdote:—

"Some years ago a Protestant gentleman happened to travel with a German Rationalist, when, their conversation turning on religion, he found himself repeatedly at a loss to answer the arguments his companion brought forward. One day the Rationalist volunteered the following remark: 'I know,' said he, 'that a much better case can be made for Christianity than you make for it: for, as a matter of fact, your position [*i.e.*, as a Protestant] is untenable supposing Christianity to be true, and therefore, in defending your own position, you are obliged to give up the strong points of Christianity. If you wish to defend it in the only way in which you can defend it, you must become a Roman Catholic.' This, as may be supposed, astonished the Protestant gentleman, who up to that time had naturally thought that Christianity could easily be defended in a Protestant form. Experience, however, had now taught him otherwise; and he could not help feeling that what the German had stated might perhaps have accounted for his unexpected defeat. He determined, therefore, to examine his own position as a Protestant, and see how far it was really tenable, consistently with the proofs of Christianity; and the result was, that within a few months he became a Roman Catholic" (p. 4).

Mr. Pye then goes on to show that the grounds upon which men commonly profess to believe Christianity really prove the truth of the Catholic Church. Then he proves (chap. ii.) that men are bound to ask themselves why they believe what they do, and that it cannot possibly be pleasing to God that men should "believe the Gospel on grounds which are seen to be inconsistent with separation from the Roman Catholic Church, and yet remain separated

from the Roman Catholic Church." To do so must be "either mortal sin or practical unbelief"; i.e., it implies either that the man remains separate from the Church, believing it to be his duty to submit to it, or else that he does not really and indeed believe the Gospel itself.

"The person therefore who knowingly, or for want of due inquiry, allows himself to remain in a position which is inconsistent with the grounds of his belief, is living in a state of deliberate mortal sin, or to say the least of it, staking his soul upon a *risk*; and there are such cases. There are some who have inquired, and who have discovered the inconsistency of a position *which they dare not leave*; while at the same time the inquiry which thus convicts them has satisfied them of the truth of Christianity. Thus they do really believe; but, alas for them, a part of their belief is, that they themselves are not *what God would have them to be*. . . . Again. There are some who *refuse to inquire*, for fear of the inconveniences to which such inquiry might lead. 'We do not wish,' they say, 'to disturb our minds with questions which have brought others into difficulties.' Thus there are Protestant clergymen who dare not look farther into the matter, for fear of the consequences of being convinced; and not only clergymen, but many others in their different stations of life, yield to the same temptation as it meets them, according to their circumstances. The tradesman, the artisan, and the peasant, in many cases, see what conversion might cost them, and therefore will not run the risk of being converted by making any further inquiry; while they flatter themselves that ignorance will be sufficient excuse at least, if they are found to be wrong" (p. 32).

Besides these, there are three other classes of men among us who continue separate from the Church. "The indifferent, the ignorant (i.e., those who are excusably so), and the sceptics." The case of the indifferent Mr. Pye meets very forcibly. They are "respectable people," who keep in the religion in which they are brought up, not treating religion with contempt, but merely making it a matter of secondary importance. They take for granted it is all right to be sound Protestants and believers in Christianity at the same time, but they do not care enough about it to inquire. Their state, Mr. Pye says, must be dangerous, "simply because they do thus make religion a secondary matter. God gave them reason that they might exercise it for His glory; and they will not take the trouble to use it, in order to discover whether or not they are what He would have them be."

As to the ignorant. "This class includes a great many who would perhaps be very indignant that such an excuse should be made for them." The great majority of religious Protestants in England, especially among the Dissenters, are "stolen children who have never heard of their mother except as a sorceress whom they must avoid *for the love of Christ*, and thus, in the very act of avoiding her, they carry out her own main principle, though they do it in an ignorant way;" say, Mr. Pye believes, with us, that there are among those who believe most nearly the truths which the Church teaches some who may really believe the strange distinctions they draw, and the seemingly unreal reasons they give, for not submitting to the Church. This he puts very well; and certainly it is hard to read his statement of what some of these men profess, still continuing to believe (as we do) that they are sincere in professing it.

But the case of the sceptical is best put—men who, in times past, have had a call to submit to the Church and have resisted it, resolving to keep what they believed ; but who have found that impossible, and have gradually slipped back into “ natural religion ” :—

“ And do not think, my reader, that this is merely an imaginary picture. It is the case of scores in England in the present day . . . some of whom would perchance have been bright lights drawing others on to salvation, if only they had entered in where many a one, who is deeply thankful for God’s undeserved mercy is, unworthy of the city into which that mercy has led him.”

Lastly, there is a class of sceptics who have become so by gradually discovering that the system in which they have been brought up is unreasonable and inconsistent with itself. They are not like those Italians and Frenchmen who dislike religion because of its restraints, or for political reasons. They may almost be called in a sense religious men. Sometimes they “ dabble in Swedenborgianism or Irvinism, or anything else ” which pretends to throw light on their path. Such a man is sometimes led to examine the faith of the Church, and the world is astonished with the tidings that such a one, whom they took for a sceptic, has “ gone over to Rome.”

Chapter III. gives an outline of positive arguments proving the claims of the Church. The only way to judge is, not to decide *à priori* that this or that doctrine cannot be true,—

“ For unless we suppose that man can, by the exercise of his reason, arrive at all truth equally with his Creator, there must be things which are not apparent to our reason, and which yet are true, so that we are not in a position to say whether Christianity itself be credible or not, till we have tested the authority by which it is proposed to us. Our object, then, now will be to test the Roman Catholic Church, with a view of examining into the truth of Christianity, as we should have done if we had lived in the times of the Apostles, for, as a matter of fact, it is by means of the Roman Catholic Church that Christianity is presented to the world at large in the present day, however else it may appear in particular localities ” (p. 46).

Mr. Pye then states the evidence to the Catholic Church from what it visibly is in the world. Reason teaches us the existence of God ; and conscience testifies that man does not fulfil the end of his creation, that something supernatural is needed to regulate the minds of men in accordance to the will of God. Now, there is one, and only one, society existing on earth, which professes to supply this want, which, with all drawbacks, succeeds in this object as none other does ; which extends throughout the whole world, and whose history, from the beginning till now, is an exception to all that is human. The proofs of this, from history in every part of the world, Mr. Pye traces in a striking and forcible manner. And it is plain that the object can be answered only by a society, and by one something like this. He concludes this chapter by saying, “ Unless, therefore, there be something in her system which contradicts your reason, reason itself ought to lead you to become a Roman Catholic.”

In Chapter IV. he answers objections to this conclusion, and in the last chapter sums up some of the arguments for it from Scripture.

We have been thus particular in our summary, because we wish our readers to form their own judgment. Ours is, that there are many classes among

whom Mr. Pye's little book is likely to be singularly useful. The Scotch, for instance, and the more educated classes of operatives in the manufacturing districts of England, need, not so much eloquence or appeals to the feelings, as hard, dry reasoning. They want, in short, a "religion of common sense"; and they have, we suspect, pretty generally a feeling that religion is merely a matter of sentiment, well enough for rich and luxurious classes, for people of both sexes who loll in easily-swung carriages as they are carried to church, but not for men who have to work their way up in the world and cannot afford to take anything for granted. No work of the same compass known to us seems so well calculated to come home to the minds of this class. We doubt whether it is likely to be extensively useful among the agricultural classes, and the wealthy perhaps need it less.

In conclusion we would express a doubt whether many readers may not be repelled when they find their own religious system labelled *z*, and another doctrine, *a*. We can imagine that there are those who will say, "We do not understand mathematics," and turn away from it without giving themselves the trouble to see, whether any knowledge of mathematics is really necessary in order to understand these very simple symbols. Mr. Pye may perhaps, consider this before the appearance of a second edition, which we heartily hope will be called for.

We think, also, that in that edition it may be well to consider, whether the part in which Mr. Pye examines the references to the four Gospels contained in the earliest ecclesiastical writings should not be revised. It seems to us that unacknowledged reference, and that not so much citing the exact words as the general sense, was the manner of those times; and that when this is considered, the references contained in the epistles of S. Clement and S. Ignatius, for instance, may fairly be taken as proofs of the familiarity of the writers with the Gospels. Mr. Pye's argument that we cannot prove the genuineness of the four Gospels without admitting testimony which also proves the authority of the Catholic Church, is most unquestionably valid; but we cannot help feeling that its effect is weakened rather than strengthened, by what may, perhaps, give to some readers, at least, the impression that he desires in any degree to explain away the early testimonies to the Gospels. At any rate, as this is intended not as a book of learned controversy, but as one in which the results established by controversy are brought home to thoughtful men who have not had the opportunity of studying it in its original sources, it would, we think, be better to omit the appendix, and shorten the statement in the text to the mere statement that Irenæus is the first ancient author by whom the Gospels are explicitly quoted, and then to show, as Mr. Pye does, his testimony to the doctrines denied by Protestants. Our high opinion of the value of the little book induces us to make these suggestions.

Manual of the Third Order of S. Francis of Assisi, called also the Order of Penance. With a Preface. By the Very Rev. Father EMIDIUS, Commissary-General of the Capuchin Order in England and Ireland.*

THIS little book professes to be published expressly "to revive, if possible, the Spirit of the Order of Secular Tertiaries in England, to make it, in fact, a reality." And the preface proceeds, after touching upon the comparatively formal manner in which the rule has been embraced in later times, to give a lively description of the lives of heroic Christianity and sanctity which it produced in its first professors.

The description of the spirit of the Third Order of S. Francis, as we meet with it in this little work, strikes us as so beautiful that we will venture to make a few short extracts; and one of the first axioms is such a holy truth that it alone might bear a meditation.

"Simplicity is one of the characteristics of God's works, and nothing could be more simple and what the world calls commonplace than the first beginnings of the Third Order. . . . It may not, canonically speaking, be regarded exactly as a religious order, because Tertiaries do not necessarily take the three vows of obedience, chastity, and poverty; but its very name implies a far higher standard than that of a simple religious congregation or confraternity. The Third Order holds a middle place between the world and the cloister. Without compelling its members to abandon their home duties, it nevertheless places them in a totally different position from that of ordinary Christians. . . . The brothers and sisters of the Third Order, if their vocation be sincere, propose to themselves two things:—1st. To live a life of penance; 2nd. To tend as far as possible to perfection, although living in the midst of the world."

It is intended however, as this book sets forth, rather to catch the spirit of its two sister orders, the first and second orders of S. Francis, than to follow their actual rules; for our little work continues:—

"To wind up what we have been saying: although the Tertiary takes only one actual vow, yet, at the moment of profession, he or she makes an actual engagement, binding him or her to a closer union with our Lord, to the practice of a far more perfect life than that of the generality of Christians, and to a never-failing charity towards all men, and especially to the sick and suffering members of Christ's body. It is impossible for them to overestimate the importance of this act of profession, neither can they afterwards desert the Third Order by returning to the world and its pleasures. . . . It tends, in fact, to revive amongst them (the Tertiaries), even in a century devoted to luxury, materialism, and indifference, the touching life of the Primitive Church."

We are told that "the duties and holy exercises prescribed by the rule remind one of the pious usages established by the Apostles; and the simplicity and austerity of their habits bring one back in thought to the first Disciples bound in the links of the same faith, the same hope, the same love."

* This notice should have appeared in our last number, but was accidentally mislaid.

Tertiaries were to lead quiet home lives in the bosom of their families, and love retreat and contemplation. The duties of mortification and poverty of spirit were earnestly enforced, although the rules of fasting and other austerities were to be remitted to those whose health would not allow of them. But the more the rule of the Third Order of S. Francis is studied, the more obvious it is, that its great and real object was to induce men to lead interior lives in the world, and to model their *hearts* by the wisdom of the Cross.

"Let us remember," continues the Manual, "that this Order was founded by a saint—by one who was the nearest reflection of the Crucified One that our poor humanity has ever seen." S. Francis of Assisi was pre-eminently this : nothing in his life ;—not his austerities, overwhelming as they appear to all who read of them ;—not his total renunciation of the world and all that it contains ;—not his angelic purity, nor his absolute poverty, or abject humility, strike the heart of the reader so forcibly as the way in which his soul meditated on the life of the Son of God. It drank, as we may say, so deeply from the cup of His sufferings, that his very body so sympathized with His soul, as to take the impress of His sacred wounds on his hands, feet, and heart. He was therefore peculiarly the saint to put forward that view of the Gospel which leads us to contemplate our Lord's life on earth. The rule of the Third Order aims at this mixed life of prayer and contemplation, joined to works of mercy and charity ; it aims at a cleansing and perfecting of the heart, amidst the daily toil and business of everyday life. And we have our Lord with His parents before us, as our model in the domestic life ; our Lord with His disciples as our model amongst our friends, or giving instruction should we be so called ; our Lord with the poor and sick ; our Lord withdrawing Himself to prayer and contemplation, yet so as to weary and inconvenience no man ; our Lord praying to His Father in heaven under coming trial and affliction, to show us whence we should seek strength and aid ; and our Lord carrying His Cross and finally nailed thereon, to show us the road up to the hill of Calvary, and the way we must crucify ourselves if we would follow in His footsteps and reach paradise ; and all this in the world ; in our domestic circle, surrounded by those relations or friends amidst whom He Himself has placed us. Our Lord wants our *heart*. My son, give me thy *heart* (Proverbs xxiii. 26). If we will give our hearts to God, all the rest will follow, even to Calvary and the gates of paradise, which will open wide to receive us, when the cruel griefs and toils of this life shall have ended. Now the rule of the Third Order of S. Francis, as we have shown, if followed devoutly, makes clear and simple the path to this life of high perfection in the world. And while many, from difficulties and real obstacles, are unable to enter convents or monasteries, yet have vocations beyond the mere performance of worldly duties in a spirit of obedience to the Catholic Church,—they may, in this order, carry out that higher imitation of the life of the Gospel supposed to be confined to the cloister.

But we must leave this little book to speak for itself, since it would take us too long to enumerate its varied excellences. Besides an account of the many great saints who belonged to the order, and shed a brilliant lustre over its rules and precepts, it mentions that many poets, painters, and other lovers of art embraced it ; amongst whom were Michael Angelo and Dante.

The book contains the rules and statutes of the order ; description of the habit ; &c. ; as well as the little office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in a large, clear type ; the substitution of this office for the Divine office having been permitted to Tertiaries when other duties prevented them from reciting the latter.

Devotion to the Nine Choirs of Holy Angels, and especially to the Angel-Guardians. Translated from the French of Henri-Marie Boudon, Arch-deacon of Evreux. By EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. London : Burns, Oates, & Co. 1869.

IT may be doubted whether any other devotional writer of the French Church, not marked for reverence by authority, is more highly or more justly revered than Boudon. One of his works, "Dieu Seul," it is well known, furnished to our revered Mother Margaret the motto which she made that of her life. That of which Mr. Thompson now gives us an excellent translation is already familiar in the original to very many English Catholics. We do not know any English book which in any degree supplies its place, and are heartily glad to see it put within the reach of English readers. Mr. Burns has done his part well. This elegant little volume keeps up the improvement which we have been glad to observe of late years in the appearance of Catholic books, and which was much needed.

Mr. Thompson's preface points especial attention to two subjects of which Boudon has treated, both of which deserve it even more now than they did when this work was published. Of these the first is "The detailed description of the various solicitations, stratagems, and subtleties which the devils employ for the destruction of souls ; a description which at least must have the effect of showing the practical nature of the devotion which it is the object of the book to inculcate. For if the spirits of hell are possessed of such tremendous power and craft, and are allowed to exercise both one and the other in assaults on mankind (and what reader of the Bible can doubt the fact ?), of what importance, of what unspeakable personal importance to every one of us it is that we should secure the aid of these far mightier beings—mightier because they are the servants and the friends of God—who are commissioned by Him to protect and assist the heirs of salvation." This sentence strikes the key-note of the whole work. For our part, we eschew the spirit which tempts men to account their own age worse than any other. The wise man's caution is pregnant, "Say not what is the cause that former times were better than they are now ? This manner of question is foolish." It may be that in the judgment of unerring Wisdom other times, which seem to us better than our own, may have had as great, although different sins and evils. But be this as it may, we cannot doubt that the characteristic of our time is that faith is weak. This is owing, doubtless, to many circumstances. The first and chief is that in countries of European civilization the poison of Protestantism has spread so widely throughout society as more or less to infect even Catholics. Another cause we take to be the wonderful

development of physical science and of the mechanical arts. In all these departments it is a just and sound principle that nothing, however it seem to be established by argument, should be regarded as certain till it has been tested by experiment; i. e., until we are able to try by the evidences of our senses whether things really are as we have been led by reasoning to expect they will be. This is the main principle of the Baconian philosophy. When applied to subjects within its own domain it is not merely sound and just, but of essential importance. But its domain is co-extensive with the subjects, with regard to which truth, though not self-evident, is attainable by man's intellect and observation, and is left to reward his discoveries. It is absurd as well as impious to assume that there can be no truth so much above man's sphere that it would never have been discovered by the unaided human intellect; or, again, that it cannot be important to him to know any such truths; or that his Creator cannot have made any of them known to him by other means. Yet this, absurdly assumed not proved, lies at the root of many modern popular errors. It is consciously and avowedly the basis of the Comtist system, which rejects all religious truth, not as demonstrably imaginary, but as being, whether in itself true or false, utterly unpractical and unimportant to man, merely because it cannot be tested by any experiment the results of which can be exhibited to his senses. Unhappily, however, the same spirit has, to a great degree, penetrated men who, so far from being Comtists, profess and believe themselves to be sincere believers in Christianity, and who, nevertheless, allow themselves to reject, or at least, to doubt many things, not because they are not revealed, but because the senses do not bear testimony to them, and therefore they could not have been discovered by human reasoning. Such is that great spiritual world, in the midst of which faith teaches us that we are living. The existence of God human reason can infer from His works, and we might reasonably have conjectured the existence of multitudes of spiritual beings, and that many of them, though finite, and therefore infinitely inferior to Him, may be raised above man by His powers to a degree which, though finite, is hardly distinguishable from infinity by our powers. Reason, again, would suggest, and, as we know, actually did suggest, that there are also evil spirits. But whether these conjectures were really true, reason by itself could not certainly decide, and they could not be brought to the test of experiment. Revelation, however, has made certain what reason could only point out as probable; and faith assures us that we are surrounded on every side by a world of spirits, which by the permission or by the command of God interfere in earthly events and in human interests, and with which, therefore, we are in truth much more really concerned than with the great majority of those earthly events which we so often allow to engross all our attention and all our thoughts. Now, this is exactly the truth which modern habits of mind lead some men to deny, and very many others, who in theory admit it, to pass over as unimportant and unpractical. Physical discoveries, in another way, tend to the same result. In simple times men were apt to assume that all phenomena, the cause of which they could not see, must result from the immediate agency of spirits. In modern times the proximate causes of many of these phenomena have been discovered. Of course this affords, in

just reason, not so much as a pre-supposition, however alight, that those physical causes may not be directed by the agency of spirits. Indeed, analogy, as far as it guides us at all, would rather lead us to infer that they might; for there is no fact in this world of which each of us is more certain, by his own daily experience, than that matter can be acted upon and affected by will. Still, it is certain that these discoveries, by proving that many phenomena, which in other ages have been referred immediately to spiritual agency, are in fact produced by immediate physical causes, have led men in general into the opposite extreme, of supposing that spiritual agency either does not exist, or at least has no practical influence and effects in the world we inhabit. Hence it is, we believe, that even Protestants of former days were in this respect so different from those of our own, so much more ready to admit the fact of spiritual agency in general, and even to recognize it in particular instances in daily life, even when they were not perhaps better religious and moral characters than many men in our own day, to whom such a notion would appear preposterous.

English Catholics, then, in our day, live year by year among men who assume this as an unquestionable first principle, reading their books, meeting and conversing with them in society, in business, in politics local and imperial. How is it possible that we should not be practically affected by it? As well might we hope to escape being modified by the air and climate in which our lives are passed. We are compelled to mix with men who naturally, and as a matter of course, take for granted what we know to be false, and who, when they mean to pay us a compliment, do it by assuring us that they do not suspect us of sharing the belief of Neapolitans or Romans upon subjects like this. Now, the truth is that if we are Catholics, nay, if we deserve the Christian name at all, although we may differ from the simple Roman or Neapolitan in not attributing this or that particular fact to spiritual agency, and therefore upon that particular fact may agree with our Protestant countrymen, still on the general principle, that is, in believing the reality of spiritual agency, not ages ago merely and in distant countries but at this moment and in the daily events of our own lives, we agree with him and radically differ from them. But it is difficult for those who are compelled by prudence and charity to sit quietly and hear others assume the unreality of such beliefs, not by degrees to lose, we do not say their intellectual conviction, but the freshness of their perception of it; in fact, less and less to realize what they believe.

We need then hardly say how valuable are works like this of Mr. Thompson's in the present day, and in our own country. They show us how near the invisible and spiritual world appeared to men who believed only what we believe, but who lived in a country and an age when faith then was more universal and more fresh. For our own parts, it may be that the very disadvantage we feel may be mercifully designed to gain for us a greater portion of the blessing promised to those who have not seen and yet have believed. But if we are to obtain it, it must assuredly be by going against the stream.

And this reminds us of the other subject to which Mr. Thompson specially directs our attention—his author's remarks upon public and political affairs. There are none which men of the present day attribute more invariably to

merely human causes. Boudon says, "When we see storms gathering either in the Church or the State, combinations to resist those who are working for the glory of God, extraordinary conspiracies to defeat some great good which is being planned in dioceses, towns, country districts, and provinces—then it is that we ought to perform frequent devotions in honour of those Powers of Heaven, that they may overturn and destroy all the sinful and miserable plottings of hell." Mr. Thompson adds :—

"Such combinations and extraordinary conspiracies we now see forming around against the Church in almost every country of Europe, fostered, and even avowedly organized, by irreligious and infidel governments ; machinations so cunningly contrived and so unrelentingly pursued, that we may well believe that they can only have their origin in Satanic hate and malice. Against these 'plottings of hell' God has given to His Church the protection of His holy angels, incomparable in their love and pity for men and their zeal for the Divine interests. Mighty, therefore, as our adversaries are, and seemingly irresistible in their fury, we may, by the aid of these glorious Spirits, baffle all their wicked counsels and scatter their forces like chaff before the wind."

We have enlarged so much upon what we deeply feel the special importance of this little book at the present moment, that we have left ourselves little space to speak in detail of its contents. But there is no need ; for the reputation of Boudon's work is established, and we think many of our readers will judge of it for themselves. The first part of the volume contains motives for this devotion—"the admirable perfection of these sublime intelligences"—their goodness, their employment in the service of men, nay, of all men, however unworthy, doing for them all things possible in temporal and in spiritual things, protecting us against the devils, and specially assisting us in the hour of death and after death. Then he shows that devotion to the holy angels is "a mark of a high predestination ;" that it promotes the glory of their Queen our Blessed Lady ; lastly, and above all, that it promotes the glory of God. The second part is occupied with suggestions and rules for the practice of this devotion : and here he takes each of the three hierarchies of Angels separately, then devotes a short chapter to the seven spirits who are before the throne of God—S. Michael, S. Gabriel, S. Raphael, and four whose names we are not told ; then recommends interior converse with the holy angels ; Novenas in their honour ; to choose certain days especially for the purpose ; to visit churches and oratories dedicated to God in their honour ; to have great confidence in their protection in all our necessities ; to do good works in their honour, and to promote devotion to them. The last chapter gives the plan of an association in honour of the nine choirs of angels. Upon this subject Mr. Thompson says :—

"There is one way of practising this devotion, which is becoming common in this country, but to which attention may here be suitably directed. It is that of honouring the Sacred Heart of Jesus, in union with the nine choirs of angels, by means of an association of worshippers leagued together for that holy purpose. This pious association is formed of different bands, each band consisting of nine adorers. To each of these adorers is assigned every month a distinct office of devotion, to be discharged in conjunction with one of the nine choirs of angels. Thus every associate enjoys the special assistance of

all the blessed Spirits in that particular choir, and is enabled to worship the Sacred Heart in a more perfect way ; his adoration also suffers less intermission, and, indeed, may be said to become perpetual, seeing that the heavenly adorers supply his place when either his necessary avocations or sleep render attention on his own part impossible. Such persons as may desire to take part in this holy league will find full directions for forming associations and regulating the exercises of the members in a little book published by Messrs. Richardson, and entitled, 'Method of Honouring the Sacred Heart of Jesus, extracted from the Life of the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque' (p. vii.).

A Sketch of the Lives of the Dominican Missionaries in Japan, including those of the Martyrs Beatified by Pius IX. By FR. BERTRAND A. WILBERFORCE, of the Order of Friar Preachers ; with a Preface by His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster. London : Philp. 1869.

THE Archbishop says in his preface,—“This beautiful little book gives a noble picture of the supernatural power, unity, and authority of the Church. In these sharp conflicts are to be seen side by side ; the sons of S. Augustine, S. Francis, S. Dominic, and S. Ignatius labouring together and mingling their blood in one stream for the love of the Good Shepherd Who laid down His life for the sheep. Truly Japan is the mother of martyrs ; and Father Francis Marales spoke with the spirit of his crucified Lord, when thirsting for martyrdom he cried out, ‘Oh, my brethren, how beautiful is the land of Japan !’ May God pour out upon us here in England the same spirit of love and sacrifice, of missionary zeal, fortitude, and self-oblation, for the sake of England and of the nations without God in the world.”

The little volume well merits the Archbishop's commendation. It is remarkable for the perfect simplicity with which it relates events as glorious, and acts of heroism as truly admirable, as any in the records of the Church of Christ. It is invested with a peculiar interest from the discoveries of last year. An Anglican writer, many of whose little books recording events in the history of the Church are singularly beautiful, writing only a very few years back, said that Japan was the only instance in the history of the world in which the Gospel of Jesus Christ, having once taken root in any country, had been wholly uprooted from it by persecution, and then added, that there were indeed some who hoped that there might still be in that land remnants of the Christianity of the seventeenth century ; but that whether it was so or not was known only to God. And he spoke truly. But the truth which was then known only to Himself, God has now for his own greater glory made manifest to the world ; and that truth is, that the history of Japan differs from that of all other nations in the world, not as that of a land from which the Church of God has been successfully eradicated, but as that of a land in which it has been preserved and kept alive under difficulties and disadvantages of the conquest of which the world affords no other example. In no other land does the history of the Church record that the converts from

heathenism, deprived of all their natural chiefs by persecution, have been able to maintain their faith in its purity for almost two hundred and fifty years without bishops, without priests, without sacraments (except Holy Baptism), without Christian books, or Christian schools or teachers. The Archbishop most truly says,—“Though overwhelmed and cut down, the Faith lived on in secret; and in our day thousands have been found who, without pastors or sacraments, have handed on their belief inviolate with its three sure tests—the authority of Rome, the celibacy of the Priesthood, the living veneration of the Mother of God.”

And this wonderful phenomena is very closely connected with the history recorded in this beautiful little volume; for it seems that devotion to the Rosary was one of the principal means by which the faith of these glorious confessors was kept up; and it was by the early Dominican missionaries that that devotion was specially introduced among their forefathers. We may add that F. Wilberforce's narrative is admirably told, and that the little book, which only runs to 234 pages, is a wonderful monument of the power of the grace of God. We extract a few words from his account of what was called “the great martyrdom,” when fifty-two, chiefly natives, among whom were included women and children, and a small handful of European missionaries offered their lives in lingering tortures to Him Whom they loved because He had first loved them.

“Before the arrival of the prisoners, bodies of soldiers had been posted at different places to preserve order and prevent a rescue being attempted. Sixty thousand spectators clustered on the hill, and of these it was computed that thirty thousand were Christians. As the prisoners from Omura first came in sight, a sound of many voices ran through the mixed multitude—exclamations of pity and of contempt, recognitions of friends, prayers, and aspirations that fortitude might be given to the martyrs. Then a deep silence followed. The multitude contemplated the condemned; the missionaries preached to the dense throng. For a whole hour the martyrs stood on the hill near the twenty-two stakes there planted, waiting for their companions. The priests took this last opportunity of preaching to the people, and encouraging the Christians. Among the rest, Father Francis Morales, after declaring that he was about to die for the true faith, begged the faithful not to be scandalized if he manifested any signs of weakness amidst the torturing flames, but to attribute them to the natural shrinking of the flesh, which is weak even when the spirit is willing. Suddenly sounds were heard from the city; every eye was turned in that direction; while cries of ‘They come! they come!’ were heard among the people. Then again followed a general silence, for the strains of voices singing in harmony filled the air, and a procession of Christian martyrs issued from the city gate, and began slowly to ascend the hill. This martyrdom, even in the early days of the Church, could not have presented a scene more touchingly beautiful. It was a solemn procession of the Rosary, to end at the feet of Mary—a triumphal progress through the portal of death into the kingdom of light. First came Mary of Fingo, clad in the white habit of the Tertiaries of S. Dominic, bearing a cross, the standard of these Christian warriors. Mary, the wife of Andrew Tocuan, followed, clad also as a Tertiary, and although only twenty-three years old, her infirmities making her unable to walk, she was carried to martyrdom. Agnes, the wife of the martyr, Cosmo Taquesa, and Catherine of Fingo, were both Tertiaries, and the latter, says Father Maynard, Prioress of the Confraternities of the

Rosary and the Holy Name. There were also several members of the Rosary Confraternities, and some children, one of these, named Peter, only three years old, and carried in his mother's arms. Another boy of five, also named Peter, walked alone to martyrdom."

But we must break off, as we might easily copy several pages more equally interesting. One thought forces itself upon us. Naturally the faith of the Christians of Japan could never have been maintained during the last two centuries and a half. Who can doubt that the wonderful grace by which it was kept alive was gained for the Church of their country by the prayers of the glorious martyrs?

In conclusion, it should be mentioned that the little volume before us is a beautiful specimen of printing and getting up, such as we hardly know where to look for except in the works published by Mr. Philp.

Of the Love of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Means of Acquiring it. By the Rev. Father NEPVEU, of the Society of Jesus. The translation edited by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. London: Burns, Oates, & Co. 1869. Pp. 105.

The Holy Hour of the Intimate Union of the Soul with Jesus in His Agony in the Garden. Translated from the Italian by a Father of the Society of Jesus. With a Preface by the Very Rev. A. WELD, S.J., Provincial. London: Burns, Oates, & Co. 1870. Pp. 68.

WE group together these two valuable little books as being of the same class—books of sacred meditation; both proceed from the same illustrious Society, exactly uniform in outward appearance, and of a size convenient for carrying to Church. Both are translations, and yet so well done that any one, we think, might read them without discovering it. And this is a praise so exceedingly rare that it ought to be awarded whenever it is possible. Unfortunately the mass of our translated books, and especially those of works of devotion, are by persons who take it for granted that to be able to read French or Italian (as the case may be) is qualification enough for a translator from those languages, quite forgetting that it is also necessary that he should be able to write English.

Father Nepveu was a French Jesuit in the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV. In these meditations he gives us—first, "eight motives for loving our Lord Jesus Christ," and then eight "means to acquire the love of Jesus Christ." The whole is simple, impressive, and well fitted for its purpose.

The last of the *means* suggested for acquiring the love of our Lord is "to join in an association for the purpose of asking of the Eternal Father the Love of His Son and conformity of Heart with Him." Such a confraternity was proposed by Saint Teresa; "as, however, she was not able to carry it

out, two great servants of God, Father Gaudier and Father Saint Jure, were inspired a few years ago to put it in practice and give it shape," it was then taken up by the author, who published a book, entitled, "Association for Entreating the Love of our Lord," obtaining at the same time a Bull from Innocent XI., of happy memory, which confirmed this association, and granted it some indulgences, which may be found at the end of the book." For further particulars of this we must refer our readers to the work itself.

We must, however, turn to the other little work, "The Holy Hour," which we have read with even greater interest than that which we have already noticed. It is more strictly than the other a form or book of meditation. The Venerable Margaret Mary Alacoque was instructed (as we read in her life) to receive Holy Communion the first Tuesday of each month, and she was promised—

"Every night, between Thursday and Friday, I will make you partaker of that sorrow unto death which it was My will to suffer in the Garden of Olives. This sorrow shall reduce you, without your understanding how, to a kind of agony more bitter than death. To join with me in the humble prayer which I then offered to my Divine Father in My agony, you shall rise before midnight, and remain with me upon your knees prostrate for an hour, with your face to the ground, to appease the anger of my Eternal Father, and to ask of Him pardon for sinners. You will thus also share with me, and in a manner soothe the bitter grief I suffered when My disciples abandoned Me, and I was constrained to reproach them that they could not watch with Me one hour. During that hour you shall do what I shall teach you. Now listen to Me, My daughter; beware of believing lightly every spirit, and of trusting them with too great facility. Satan is raging with a desire to deceive you, and therefore beware of doing anything without the consent of your Director."

In the year 1673 our Lord made the following revelation to her, as she declared in writing, in obedience to her superiors :—

"While I was attentively meditating in prayer upon the only object of my love, in the garden of Olives, overwhelmed with sorrow, and in an agony of living but most cruel grief, and feeling within me a most vehement desire of sharing His anguish, He lovingly said to me as follows :—'Here I suffered interiorly more than in all the remainder of my Passion, beholding Myself abandoned by Heaven and earth, and loaded with the sins of all mankind. Moreover, I appeared thus in the presence of the God of sanctity, Who, without regard to my innocence, crushed Me in His fury, and made Me drink the chalice filled with the bitterness and gall of His just indignation, as though He had forgotten the name of Father, and would sacrifice Me as a victim to His anger.' No creature is capable of comprehending the unspeakable torment I then endured. It is the same pain the guilty soul feels when presented before the tribunal of the justice of God. His infinite holiness oppresses, crushes, and overwhelms it in its just fury. Now my justice, He added, is provoked, and ready to punish secret sinners with open chastisements unless they quickly betake themselves to worthy penance. I will make you know when my justice is about to deal its blows upon the heads of these miserable souls, and it shall be when you feel my sanctity weigh heavily upon you. Then you shall lift up your heart and hands to Heaven with the offering of prayers and good works, presenting Me continually to my Father as a victim of love, in sacrifice and oblation for the

sins of the whole world, and placing me as a secure bulwark between His justice and sinners, to obtain mercy, with which you shall feel encompassed when I shall be pleased to grant my favours to any one of these sinners. You must then offer Me to My Father in thanksgiving for the mercy I have shown. You shall know also when that soul will persevere and be saved, for I will make you partaker of some gleams of the joy which the Blessed have in Heaven, and that by the communication of My love."

The little work before us gives meditations and prayers suitable to this beautiful and touching devotion, and the rules of the confraternity erected in the convent of the Visitation at Paray-le-Monial, where the Blessed Margaret Mary lived, and where her relics rest, for carrying it out. We must commend our readers to the work itself for them; they will find it well repay their attention.

The Life of B. Charles Spinola, S. J. By JOSEPH BROECKAERT, S. J.
New York: J. G. Shea.

WE can scarcely convey to readers a sense of the thrilling interest of this life; it surpasses in heroic marvels almost any other narrative of the kind we have met with. Frequently in the case of martyrdoms, one is almost led to believe that the Saints who underwent them had lost supernaturally all sense of pain; but the letters which the glorious martyr B. Charles contrived to transmit to Rome from his frightful prison, prove that his senses and capability of suffering were neither deadened nor lulled by the heroic dispositions of his soul, although the marvellous Faith he professed upheld his fortitude through all. The wonders of Divine Grace are sufficiently exhibited in those whose period of torment is brief though severe, but all must acknowledge that little short of a miracle must have been needed to sustain the courage of B. Charles and his companions during the lingering martyrdom of four years which preceded their final fiery trial. When we read of the martyrs—sometimes thirty-three in number—confined to an enclosure 24 palms by 16 palms in extent, and never quitting this prison for an instant during *four years*, we can form some idea of the power of the religion whence sprang the constancy which did not fail even in this living grave. The enclosure was like a bird-cage, the cross-bars exposing the holy sufferers to all the inclemencies of the season; and latterly the stench became such, that as B. Charles himself expressed it, it caused him "to raise his sighs to Heaven."

By no means the least interesting part of this book is the introduction, giving a sketch of the recent progress and present condition (up to 1867) of the Japanese Mission. A list also at the end of all the Japanese martyrs beatified in 1867, with a slight outline of each, is both interesting and useful, as far too little is known in general concerning these confessors of the Faith.

Adelaide Capece Minutolo. Par M^{de}. AUGUSTUS CRAVEN, née La Ferronnays. Pp. 170. Paris : Didier. London : Burns & Oates.

WE have read with keen enjoyment this short sketch of a beautiful, happy, useful life ; a chaplet worthy of the head for which it has been woven by the skilful hands of Mrs. Craven, but which she is only able to hang upon the tomb of one so dear to her. The charm of her style (as we need hardly tell those who have read the "*Récit d'une Sœur*," and who has not ?) would suffice to make attractive anything that she wrote ; but apart from this, no one can read this uneventful narrative without feeling that her departed friend was one of those who most justly and most closely wind themselves about the hearts of those whose privilege it is to share their daily lives.

The feature most remarkable in the life of Adelaide Capece Minutolo is one which gives it special interest in our eyes, and makes it, we think, important at the present day. In Italy, Mrs. Craven says, far more than even in France the notion prevails, which is so much more prevalent in France than in England, that a woman has no choice in life to make except between marriage and a convent.

"For a woman who does not marry no place is reserved in the world, and less than any where else in the high world to which she and her sisters belonged. And therefore any girl who by some exceptional circumstance does not marry, as soon as she is deprived by death of her natural protectors, is bound to find others, and in return for the protection with which people will not hear of her dispensing, she is obliged to submit to conditions hard enough fully to justify the antipathy which is almost universally felt for the very name as well as the position of an old maid. To her years bring nothing of independence, and never remove the trammels which were designed for the protection of her youth, but from which age never sets her free."

Adelaide and her two sisters, daughters of a Neapolitan noble, whose family history runs back to the times when our Saxon fathers were converted to Christianity by S. Augustine, were early left by his death under the care of a tender mother, a Spanish lady of high family. The death of the mother, when the eldest of the three had just married, left the two younger at their own disposal. The best matches were in their power, if they had chosen to accept them. But, says Mrs. Craven,

"She looked life in the face, and honestly asked of herself what were the conditions necessary to her happiness in it. She saw clearly that in her eyes happiness meant peace, perfect sympathy of two hearts and two souls, a perfect conformity of tastes, and a oneness of will to walk side by side in a path which, without being singular, was always tending upwards, and from which God was always in sight. She was conscious that she was already possessed of this ideal without having to seek it where it was uncertain whether she would attain it, in married life, and amid the passionate and glittering joys of the earth. She wished for nothing more. Clotilde, her younger sister was united to her by a oneness of sentiment which fulfilled all the

conditions of what she had dreamed. To her she proposed that they should seek for nothing beyond that of sharing their lives together, *de ne rien chercher au delà de leur vie à deux*. Both agreed not to marry and never to separate. Opportunities of changing her resolution were afterwards presented to Adelaide, on terms which might have touched her heart and flattered her vanity. But nothing ever induced her to waver, and no regret ever came to make either of them doubt the wisdom of their choice from the day on which that choice was made until, eight-and-twenty years later, they were parted by death."

No one will say that such a life should be more than the exception ; and English people, we think, will be inclined to believe that in a country in which marriages of affection and inclination were the custom, the "ideal" which Adelaide had formed would have seemed to her, to say the least, more likely to be realized in marriage than in any other state of life. Still, it must ever be a hazard ; and it is impossible to doubt that she had a better chance of realizing it by taking for her companion for life a sister whose tastes she knew to be the same with her own, than by marrying under the only conditions that the social system of Naples put within her power. She declared her resolution to be "the founder in Naples of the institution of old maids ;" and perhaps hardly anything that she could have done would have so much tended to raise women to their just place in society. For how can they in any degree be the equals of men if it be an established rule in society that a man has the choice of married or of single life, but that for a woman, unless she be married, there is no place in society. It was this social prejudice that she and her sister resolved to break through : and they succeeded. They began, no doubt, with great advantages, as the representatives on both sides of ancient and illustrious families, with high rank, unusual talents and education, and a fortune competent though not splendid ; above all, with the knowledge of God, and loving Him above all things. They were happy too, in that their lot was cast in the most beautiful corner of the whole earth, and under the most radiant of skies, on the shores of the Bay of Naples. On certain days they received, in their villa and its grounds, which ran down to the sea, the best society of Naples ; but their chief pleasure was on the others, when their time was devoted to painting, study, and music ; both sisters having a talent rarely found amongst amateurs, not only in executing but in composing it. But to these they added, or rather, they placed in the first rank with these, numerous works of charity, unostentatiously performed on every side of them. If any one of these were specially dear to Adelaide, it was the instruction of some poor boys, whom Adelaide gathered about her, and on whom she lavished the choicest treasures of Christian charity and religious culture. On these days there was little time to spare, even for the most intimate friends ; yet they were never shut out, and they found them far preferable to those on which she was surrounded by society ; and yet no one, says Mrs. Craven, could justly estimate her who had not watched her also in the midst of this, for which she had a special talent. What was more valuable and more unusual was, that she never said a word to the discredit of any one. Yet she was distinguished for the readiness and penetration characteristic of the Neapolitans ; and for a vivid imagination, stored with images of beauty, and keenness of wit, which were all her own.

"Sweet, indeed, it was to converse with Adelaide on that beautiful terrace, from which the eye takes in the whole bay. On the left Naples, Vesuvius, and the mountains which form their background; before us, those which tower over Castellamare and Sorrento, while their graceful and majestic outline stretches to the extremity of the opposite shore; above our heads the bright sky, at our feet the still blue sea. When the garden-gate was closed, and the din of the world seemed as much excluded as the sounds of the city, it was not difficult to talk intimately; and neither did all these smiles of nature prevent our conversation from being serious. Then came naturally to her lips her real feelings, those which before the world were not to be seen. These are the conversations which remain fixed in the memory" (p. 18).

Among her occupations, painting seems, on the whole, to have been the favourite. By a chance very rare in her country, the district which immediately surrounded her was without a church. She undertook to provide one; and the whole of its ornaments, whether in pictures, sculpture, or carved wood, were the work of her own hands. The expense of building, however, as always happens, turned out more than had been expected, and so much exhausted the property of the sisters, that they resolved to leave their villa and live in a part of the new edifice opening into the church. Here was Adelaide's home for the remainder of her days.

But these days were not to be prolonged. Long before, she had interrupted Mrs. Craven, when speaking of death, by saying, "Death! but death is no more"; and then explaining herself, "As it is, I exercise perception, prayer, affections, intellect. These are my life now, and will be so to its appointed limit. Then this life will undergo a change. It will become better, but it will not be broken off. I shall still exercise perception, prayer, affections, intellect. It is a change of life, not an interruption of life. Where is death, then?" . . . "But the sufferings through which one may have to pass before leaving this life!" She made the gesture which in Italian means that a thing is of no consequence. And then she said, "Much may be borne if people do not occupy themselves with what they are suffering, as far as that is possible. And when that becomes difficult, God gives His help, and with that nothing is impossible." Words like these are easily spoken. There are those who would fear to indulge in them, lest they should sound like the prayer, "Lord, if it be Thou; bid me come to Thee on the water"; and He answered, "Come." But who shall dare to blame them when that gracious word has been spoken and obeyed, and when the disciple has been preserved from fear even in the midst of the wildest storm? And this was the experience of Adelaide. In the midst of her happy, peaceful life, she found growing in her the seeds of a malady, hideous, lingering, tormenting, and deadly; but she knew no fear. She was subjected to a terrible operation; and at the moment when she learned that it was inevitable, "I was overcome as I looked upon her," says Mrs. Craven, "and did not dare to speak; but she was more calm than I. 'Do not be disturbed,' she said; 'I am not afraid.' And then, kissing me, she whispered, in a tone never to be forgotten, 'I love God more than ever before.'"

The operation lasted three-quarters of an hour, and the effect of chloroform (which was used) went off after the first twelve minutes. "She told us afterwards

that when she became perfectly conscious, she heard one of the assistants say to another, 'I never saw such courage in a woman,' and the other replied, 'It's no secret where their courage comes from.' This gave her pleasure, 'but,' she added, 'after all it was not courage; it was only a little love.'

The operation seemed for a time to have saved her life; but the deadly malady returned, and she sank to rest January 9, 1869, with words on her lips which she had repeated over and over again in her last struggle, "*In Te Domine speravi, non confundar in æternum.*"

The whole account of her illness is most beautiful, touching, and engrossing. The little volume also contains a number of most interesting letters, written chiefly to the daughter of her elder sister, whose education she had in a great measure conducted. No one can be more conscious than we are, how very little of the perfume of the original is retained in the extracts we have somewhat unwillingly forced ourselves to subject to the cruel process of translation.

Since this notice was written, Miss Emily Bowles has conferred on English Catholics the great boon of publishing an English translation of the work, at Mrs. Craven's desire.

Cantorbéry, une Ville de Souvenirs à propos du Mouvement Religieux en Angleterre. Par F. X. PASSE, Professeur d'Histoire. Clermond—Ferand; topographie Mont-Louis. London: Burns, Oates, & Co.

WE are much accustomed to notices of foreign countries by English travellers. It is not so often that we meet with a foreigner's notice of England, and so strange is English society to most men of the Continent, that when we do we are often amused by enormous misconceptions of English society and habits. We need hardly refer to the late case of Victor Hugo, who wrote after spending among us an exile of some seventeen years. Professor Passe gives us only a few pages, but he understands us better. The first part of the pamphlet is devoted to the early history of Kent, Cæsar's invasion, S. Augustine's mission; then he passes to S. Thomas of Canterbury and Henry II., and traces some of the great historical events connected with the tomb of the martyr; and ends with a cordial acknowledgment of the changed feeling of England in the present day, as shown in the public feeling towards Sir Thomas More. The Professor understands, and cordially sympathizes with, the religious movement now in operation among us, although we fear he would not satisfy the advocates of "corporate reunion" any more than does the Holy Father Himself, or our own Archbishop.

The Writings of Madame Swetchine. Edited by Count de FALLOUX, of the French Academy. Translated by H. W. Preston. New York: The Catholic Publication Society; London: Burns, Oates, & Co. 1869.

WE have no space here to do anything like justice to Madame Swetchine. Of her, therefore, we shall say nothing; and of the work, of which this volume is a translation, only that it is worthy of its author. We confine ourselves to the translation. This we think at least equal, we incline to say superior, to the mass of translations; for instance, it is far superior to that given by an English translator of the journals, and again of the letters, of Eugénie de Gérin, and to that of the valuable work of M. Cochin on Slavery, by an American. If, however, we should content ourselves with saying this, we might be understood to mean that it is satisfactory, and does justice to the original; and that impression we could not with truth allow ourselves to convey. The fact is, that there are real differences of opinion among persons of education, as to the standard which a translator ought to strive to attain. It may well be, therefore, that a translation which we should pronounce to be excellent, would be condemned without hesitation by the translator of the work before us. In our judgment no translation is satisfactory, which might not be read aloud without suggesting to any hearer that what he heard was not an original English work. Many translators, we believe, would not merely find it difficult to attain to this standard—so much all must admit—but would consider it a mistake to aim at it. Their ideal is to give what every one who knew French would recognize as a French sentence, in words which will be intelligible to an English reader who does not know it. We can hardly say how great and how fatal a mistake this seems to us. Our opinion is, that to any one who can read the original any translation is of necessity worse than useless; and that to one who cannot, a work loses just so much of its value, as it falls short of being what we may reasonably suppose the author would have written, had English, not French, been his native language. It is true, this imperatively requires that the turn of the sentences, the idiomatic phrases, &c., should be as much changed as the actual words. In fact, it is necessary that the sentences, as well as the words, should be translated. This, of course, implies some considerable sacrifice of the literal character of the translation. In our judgment a literal translation is a most imperfect one, if indeed it deserves to be called a translation at all. For assuredly no two men that ever lived, one being a Frenchman and the other an Englishman, if they desired to express exactly the same thought, would express it with merely this difference, that one would use French and the other English words. The result is that what we should praise as an idiomatic, others might perhaps condemn as not a literal translation; what they would praise we should pronounce to be hardly a translation at all.

The translator of the volume before us, then, has set before herself an

ideal of excellence different from ours, and it is therefore no wonder that she has not attained ours.

We give one or two examples to illustrate our meaning. Let any one read the following sentence out loud, and see whether any one of his audience would think it possible that it should be the natural expression in England of the thoughts of any person in the world :—

“One must needs have tried corporeal infirmity, parted with his keenest repugnance, and afterwards became reconciled thereto, if he would know on what peaceful terms one may live with humiliation, habitual suffering, and constant inconvenience” (p. 191).

Again :—

“Exaggerated expressions do not chord with the idea, and wound the ear of an exact mind” (p. 7).

These we might call merely French sentences in words more or less English. We might give similar instances from almost every page of the volume if it were necessary. In fairness we ought to add that there could hardly be a French writer more difficult to translate than Madame Swetchine. The short epigrammatic terms of French aphorisms are the despair of a translator.

We must not conclude our notice without adding that the book is beautifully printed and got up. In this respect it seems to us to mark an era in the history of Catholic publications. Till very lately they have been, as a general rule in these respects, sadly inferior to Protestant books ; not without excuse, as Catholics in these countries are so much the poorer body. Lately, however, we have seen with great pleasure a decided improvement in this respect in Catholic works published in England ; although we could not honestly say that it has, as yet, extended to the books put out by all Catholic publishers. The volume before us proves that it has fully extended to the United States. Nothing could be better than the type, the effect of the toned paper, and the elegant though unadorned covering ; all is exceedingly creditable to the New York Catholic Publication Society, and we heartily hope they will succeed in maintaining the standard they have set.

S. Charles and His Fellow-Labourers. London : Dillon.

IN the introduction to this little book, which is brought out under the sanction of the oblates of S. Charles, one sentence may serve as the key-note to the whole. All persons interested in the education of youth should take it deeply to heart. It is an appeal used by a certain number of little boys who go about the streets of Rome on Sundays endeavouring to bring together children for instruction in Christian doctrine. “Fathers and Mothers, send your children to learn the Christian doctrine or answer for it to God.” We wish these words could be made to sound

effectually through the length and breadth of our metropolis, and in the courts and alleys where so many of our Catholic poor have their dwellings. It is not too much to say that the work of teaching Christian doctrine and bringing the young within the sphere of its influence, is one of the most important works of the age. Infidelity is daily gaining strength; its deadly poison is becoming infused with fatal success, to our own certain knowledge, into the minds of boys of eleven and twelve years of age. When such is the case, we are surely bound to use energetic efforts to counteract a dreadful poison of disease which is beginning to manifest itself.

As far indeed as zeal is in question, we are convinced there exists no deficiency on the part of those upon whom devolves the office of teaching Christian doctrine. We may be permitted, however, perhaps to think that frequently there is an absence of a good *organization* for the furtherance of this important object. And we trust that the diffusion of the little work we are noticing will have the effect of making Catholics perceive the enormous good that may be accomplished by collecting together children for instruction in our Sunday schools.

The pamphlet is divided into two parts. The first treats of the Apostolic spirit of S. Charles. Whilst mention is made of the several shapes in which this spirit developed itself, our Saint's mission in particular is seen to be this, viz., to revive faith in a people abandoned to ignorance and vice. For the furtherance of this object he was gifted, we are told, with a marvellous personal charity. And it was specially with regard to *ignorant little children* that this feeling exhibited itself. The root and basis of this yearning for their welfare was of course the importance of the individual soul. If anything were needed to stimulate the Saint's ardour in aiming at and reaching the immortal part of even the lowest creature, it was the thought how our Blessed Lord himself had laboured in order to gain the soul of the Samaritan woman. "Wonder," he would say, "wonder, as you think how anxious our Saviour showed himself for the *one* soul of that vile and wretched woman of Samaria. Christ gave a considerable portion of time to ensure the salvation of that particular soul. This fact, he urges, ought to be a spur to the zeal of all."

Next we are told of his jealousy for the service of God. Parents should not only themselves come to church, but bring with them their children, even though the latter are not as yet capable of understanding the meaning of what they see and hear. This suggestion of the Saint strikes us as most important; for in the first place, as regards the children of the poor in London, a negative good, at all events, is thereby done. You are keeping them for a certain period of time at a distance from the streets and all the abominations and bad influences with which they are associated. But this is not all. It is a great and decided advantage to accustom children to the Church as a place differing in its purpose from all others, and to the various objects which invest it. The constantly beholding the priest, moreover, in his official capacity of instructing and catechizing must have a certain amount of good influence upon minds even very slightly developed.

The second portion of the treatise shows how S. Charles carried out practically the great work of reaching the souls of the uneducated, old and young. When he came into residence as Archbishop of Milan, he made the confraternity of Christian doctrine his first care. In his first Provincial Synod he issued a decree to all parish priests that on every Sunday and festival day they should teach the Catechism in their churches; and, moreover, he insisted that they should exhort from the pulpit all, both old and young, to take up energetically the work he had so much at heart. Next, a local organization was given to each confraternity; and we direct special attention to one set of officials upon whom would devolve obviously one of the most important functions for the success of the great work. These were the persons who, characteristically enough, were called "Fishers," and whose duty it became to traverse the towns and villages and bring to church the youth and growing-up population of both sexes to receive instruction in the principles of their religion. This idea, we conceive, ought to be taken up by ourselves if we look for any element of success in a work established on the same principles as that of S. Charles. The employment of persons who will make it a point to visit the houses of parents, to urge and encourage them to send their children to catechism and to reprove any unnecessary absence of the latter, this we consider—if any permanent good is to be effected—an essential feature in any well-organized system of Sunday-school teaching. Then we may look perhaps for some of the encouraging results which marked the work of the great Archbishop.

The assiduity with which the classes for Christian doctrine met Sunday after Sunday showed itself in a success truly marvellous. When S. Charles took possession of his see, there was an utter absence of schools for instruction in religion; at his death, 740 schools, representing scholars to the amount of 40,000, were in permanent existence in the city and diocese of Milan.

The New School History of England, from Early Writers and National Records. By the Author of "The Annals of England." Oxford and London: James Parker & Co. 1870.

THE author of this little volume promises us, in a very condensed form, a history drawn from original authorities. He has weighed them conscientiously and diligently. We have not often seen a book which more strikingly illustrated the revolution in the whole manner of writing history which has been wrought out in the last half-century. We have turned especially to the periods most disfigured by the misrepresentations of bigotry, and we find our author, though a Protestant, stating facts with a degree of fairness and scrupulousness to truth until very lately quite without example

VOL. XIV.—NO. XXVII. [*New Series.*]

U

among Protestant historians. For instance, the reign of Mary is thus written. It begins :—

“ Few sovereigns have a worse name among general readers than this Queen ; but this is the result of her enemies only having written her history ; for it is certain that she suffered far more, and was far more influenced by conscience in what she did than any other of the House of Tudor. She had hardly emerged from childhood when the trouble about her parents' marriage began, and from that time forward until her accession to the throne, she lived in constant dread as to her liberty, if not her life ; being obliged to make the most humiliating submissions to her brutal father, and sheltered from the violence of her brother's advisers only by their fear of the power of Charles V. In all these anxious years her only consolations were her religious exercises, her books, and such acts of charity as her limited income allowed. She had seen her mother die broken-hearted, and her tutor lose his life rather than slander his royal mistress ; she had seen the Countess of Salisbury, her governess, and many of her intimate friends put to death ; others had pined for years in the Tower ; and when she became Queen she had just escaped a cunningly devised scheme for her destruction. It is not, then, to be wondered at that she found it too hard to pardon all the prominent actors in so much evil, though she did pardon many. Any blame that is to be given must, in part at least, be born by her advisers, and part must also be attributed to the then system of government which looked on any pardon too freely granted as a sign of weakness and an abandonment of the duty of a ruler ” (p. 276).

“ One of the persons who had been most harshly treated by Edward's advisers was Bonner, Bishop of London. He had been deprived of his see, and had been imprisoned for years in the Marshalsea, this place being chosen as a studied insult, as none but the vilest malefactors, pirates, and murderers were usually sent there. He had, however, a spirit that such usage could not break, and on one of the many occasions that he was brought before the Council, he replied to their threats : ‘ Three things I have ; to wit, a small portion of goods, a poor carcase, and my own soul. The two first you may take, though unjustly. But as for my soul, ye cannot get it.’ Of course he was set free on the accession of Mary.”

With regard to the reformers, although always spoken of with a gentleness which curiously contrasts with the language of Dr. Littledale and other modern Anglicans, there is no disposition to make them heroes, saints, or martyrs.

“ The lamentable events known as the Marian Persecution followed (A.D. 1555), but the odium of this cannot with justice be laid on the Queen, as is usually done. It is rather the harsh spirit of the age than any one, two, or three individuals (say Mary, Gardiner, and Bonner) that should bear the blame. The victims themselves had shown that they were willing to act in a similar way.”

About Mary Queen of Scots the author's tone is equally fair. So again about the Crusades, and again about Elizabeth's persecution of the Catholics. In fact, the only instance we have seen to the contrary is a statement accusing Garnet, the Jesuit, of taking a part in the powder plot ; for which, if he has really any authority not hitherto known, it ought certainly to have been given, for it contradicts all former authorities. The author's general tone being what it is, we do not set it down as mere calumny, but cannot help thinking that he has made some strange mistake.

We have specified these important particulars, feeling how important it is

that truth upon them should be put within the reach of English schoolboys who have hitherto been studiously fed with lies against the religion of their forefathers. But we may say that the author seems to have been equally careful and honest in his treatment of political and historical questions in general. There are, of course, points on which we do not agree with him; for instance, in his estimate of the evidence against Richard III. But he is always so honest and laborious, that we respect his conclusions even when we do not accept them. The chief blemish we have seen in the book is an occasional carelessness of style. So condensed a narrative also, from the necessity of the case, fails in being so brilliant as the detailed histories of our times. But the book deserves all commendation.

The Catholic Directory, Ecclesiastical Register, and Almanac for the year of Our Lord 1870. London: Burns, Oates, & Co.

WE congratulate the Editor on the compilation of the New Catholic Directory for this year, which, in addition to the usual Calendar, contains much varied and valuable information, specially useful to both priests and laity. The Appendix on Œcumenical Councils cannot fail to be serviceable to many Catholics even, who may not have studied the subject, and we specially recommend it to the perusal of Protestants, by whom we are continually asked, "What is the meaning and what is the use of an Œcumenical Council?" This little sketch gives a list of all former councils, their special acts, &c., and adds some interesting details as to the Vatican Council now sitting.

-
1. *The Tonic Sol-fa System for Sight Singing in Schools.* Parts I and II. London: Burns & Oates.
 2. *A Singing Class Primer; or, the First Rudiments of the Art of Singing for Schools.* By the Rev. HENRY FORMBY. London: Burns & Oates.
 3. *The Catholic School Song-book.* Edited by the Rev. HENRY FORMBY. London: Burns & Oates.
 4. *Music for the Catholic School Song-book.* In Two Parts. Melodies for the Junior School Song-book; Melodies for the Senior School Song-book. London: Burns & Oates.

OUR main hope of seeing the dawn of better times in Church choirs and singing lies in our being able to improve our resources for teaching singing in all our mission schools. The mission school points itself out as the natural nursery of the singers for the Church who are hereafter to prove

docile and amenable to direction in the execution of the music of the Church. Consequently, most intimately connected with the question, "*What can be done for the amelioration of church choirs and church singing?*" is the question, "*What can be done to introduce an improved cultivation and practice of singing in all our mission schools?*"

Before we attempt to deal with some of the chief practical difficulties that will certainly rise up in the way, and which must be overcome, we may do well to recur to the well-known maxim of homely wisdom that "*where there is a will there is a way.*" We shall readily grant that to succeed in im-planting in the mission school a well-sustained and moderately-skilful pursuit of the study and practice of singing, is an achievement of the very highest order, both as regards merit and utility; and that perhaps no one thing done in the school will be found to equal this in the point of promoting general cheerfulness, happiness, and universal well-being of all connected with the school. Let us look a little more at this in detail.

1. The church will gain the invaluable benefit, that the music and singing of the school will be continually bringing to light a talent for singing in the scholars that may be in due time turned to the very best account for the service of the church choir. 2. The school will reap the invaluable gain that its scholars will always be kept lively and in good spirits. A continual variety of songs and little musical *jeux d'esprit* will keep up a vein of cheerfulness and vivacity, which is the most conducive thing that can possibly be to the progress of learning and study. And when the scholars are in the street in groups, amusing themselves with singing what they have learned in the school, nothing is more common than for the children of neighbouring families to be so pleased that they importune their parents to be allowed to go to the same school. 3. The families of the children are also greatly the gainers, for the children carry back to the winter fireside and the home circle the same songs that are their delight in the school, and both cheer and charm their parents with the refinement of a cultivated taste in music which, but for the wisdom and the charity which have dictated that the scholars of the school should have all these things taught to them, would never have found its way into their humble abodes. 4. Besides, nothing is fitted to act as a more powerful corrective of the dreadful rudeness and almost total ruin, in point of polish and civilization, into which vast numbers of the Catholic poor have fallen, than the practice of singing together. Excessive roughness and rudeness are not compatible with such singing, and when a multitude of children are familiarized with the practice of thus singing in chorus together in the school-hours, the more savage and rude specimens quickly make themselves odious and disagreeable to the others, who soon begin, in self-defence, to make such war on their rudeness and savagery that the delinquents are either cured of their rudeness, or, if incurable, they end by being ejected, to the great comfort and joy of those who are really seeking to improve themselves. Yet, but for this special efficacy of the charming practice of singing together in school-hours in chorus, the ruder specimens of the school would be far more likely to set the fashion to others, and to propagate their own rudeness, than to benefit by any example better than their own. From all this to the

singing of hymns and other sacred pieces—whether in school or church—the transition is easy and obvious.

We have been able to touch upon only in the most cursory manner the many advantages that are to be reaped from introducing the best system of teaching singing that is to be found possible into the mission school, and from encouraging the scholars, within limits, in the excellent practice of singing in chorus together during the school hours. But we cannot do otherwise than hope, that when the Charity which solidly presides over Catholic education comes to see what a rich and promising work lies before it, it will never rest till it finds that it is in the way to be accomplished.

We must then begin by first having the principle clearly established, and firmly fixed and rooted in the minds of all who are either engaged in or have any control over the work of education, that "singing," within the limits of what is reasonable and practicable, is an essential and indispensable part of the teaching and life of every mission school. We would even contend that it is so essential and so indispensable to the efficiency and well-being of the school, that without it the school must necessarily be deeply wounded in that which most intimately belongs to its life. It must seriously fail, at least, in one important point, in adequately discharging its duties to the scholars whom it receives; for among the gifts which God gives indiscriminately to the scholars is the universal sense of the power and charm of music. "Music hath charms to soothe the savage breast," and while all bow to the enchantment of the divine art, a large proportion of the scholars are actually gifted with good musical capacities, which loudly call for cultivation at the hands of their instructor in the Catholic school. It is scarcely possible to pay a visit to a large Catholic school, and there to see, as so frequently may be seen, bright eyes and intelligence beaming out of faces not always the cleanest, nor covered with surroundings of garments always the most irreproachable, without sometimes experiencing the feeling, "What a pity it is there should be such a fund of good musical capacity allowed to lie so dormant and so unproductive." "How very much civilizing and refining influence is here frustrated of its softening and beneficent aspect." Priests who have built large schools, often at a great outlay and risk of funds, begin to complain that the population fails to appreciate the work which has cost them so much risk and anxiety. The school teachers are installed in the spic and span new building; the drill work begins in great earnest in the No. I., II., III., &c. standards; and the spirit of the Pharaoh of the nineteenth century says to the youth of the mission, "Get you to your burdens," or, in other words, "Work away at the standards." But for the young mind, the working away at the standards has singularly little that is attractive. Blind and dead to all the civilizing and improving influences of the "work of the standards," our school boys immensely prefer the freedom of the streets to being thus disciplined.

We have found ourselves led step by step to the crowning reason why the due cultivation of music and singing in Catholic schools is a question of such sovereign and paramount importance to their well-being, that it is scarcely possible to exaggerate its value. The mission school *must* be filled; *compulsion* is simply out of the question, but not so *attraction*. And what more powerfully draws scholars to a school or makes them happier and more

cheerful in it than a wise and competent cultivation of the social art of singing? The scholars that are once brought to taste the real sweets of such singing, are never likely either to forsake the school that has opened the door for them to such enjoyment, or to forget—even in after life—their debt of gratitude to it.

But, of course, we cannot be otherwise than well aware that Catholic charity has a great and laborious work before it in order to arrive in any fair measure at such competent instruction in singing, of the vast multitude of scholars frequenting Catholic schools as will be able to cause them to taste its cheering and comforting sweets, and bring them fully under the power of its softening and civilizing influence. But then when was Catholic charity ever afraid of the labour and painstaking requisite to effect its objects? One thing may be pronounced to be quite certain: that the work of charity which has to be done must be something much more than the work of the mere professional music-master. But, at the same time, who will doubt but that a certain trained skill and proficiency in the art of music belongs to the teacher of singing in a mission school.

Here, then, is the problem of charity for the work of education that has to be done for the multitudes that have to come into and to pass through our mission schools. It is a problem not to be by any means solved in a moment; rather it will be of the nature of a deep chronic solicitude for all who have any responsibilities in connection with the mission school. However, a useful and important step in advance has been gained in the recent publication of the "Catholic Song-Book," which we have placed at the head of our article. Mr. Formby's labours in this department have more than once been noticed in the pages of our Review; and all his various collections of songs are here brought into one uniform shape, in a clear type and neat form, and offered at a cheap price, with not a small number of very racy and charming new additions. Here is certainly plenty of excellent material at hand for the practice we have been so strongly advocating of encouraging the singing of songs in chorus during the school-hours. But perhaps even a greater service still is rendered by Mr. Formby in his little "Singing-Class Primer." As we have said, charity alone will not succeed in teaching singing in the mission school; we must have a fair sufficiency of musical skill and science besides. The labour of the mere professional teacher of music, even if it could be commanded, though in many cases it might doubtless render the greatest service, would not fully answer the end in view. The school where singing is really domesticated as part of its established system for the solid Catholic training and improvement of youth requires to possess on its own staff one who is competent to act as teacher in the work of forming and carrying forward a singing-class in the school, and as a precentor or precentrix to lead and preside over whatever may be sung chorus-wise by the scholars during school-hours. We cannot then but greatly commend the little manual to general notice, the "Singing-Class Primer," containing, as it does, in a short space a very clear statement of what is required to make a teacher of singing in a school, and also as offering very valuable aid and assistance to all who may really wish to qualify themselves for the work of teaching such

singing, besides being a cheap, useful manual to put into the hands of promising pupils. The publications of Mr. Curwen and others on the Tonic Sol-fa system will be useful in continuing and completing the course of musical instruction.

Fairy-land. A Series of Pictures from the Elf World. By RICHARD DOYLE. With a Poem by William Allingham. London: Longmans, Greens, Reader, & Dyer.

THIS beautiful book is full of fancies so exquisite that they defy description, and we recommend all to provide themselves with the means of personal examination by becoming purchasers of so graceful a work of art. Each of the numerous plates exhibits a fertility of imagination, such as could be displayed by Mr. Doyle alone. There is a charming simplicity about the elves depicted that is particularly attractive—in making love as in playing the wildest of elfin freaks they retain the same round childish face—sometimes mischievous, sometimes innocent-looking—that seems an elf's indispensable characteristic. Humming-birds, beetles, and butterflies, take a prominent place in these pictures, and add greatly to the general grace of the conception. The insects are particularly well executed, defying with perfect safety a naturalist's inspection as to their correctness of design and colour. A large assortment of butterflies is exhibited in the unrivalled picture of the Fairy Queen's Airy Drive (p. 24). The queen's car is composed of a floating blossom, and her little elfin coachman seems to manage with the greatest ease a team of twelve butterflies, guided only by reins so slender that they seem to have been extracted from a cobweb. Another very life-like butterfly is introduced in the pretty little picture entitled "A Dancing Butterfly" (p. 8), where an elf seems plaguing the poor insect much as children sometimes plague dogs and cats by making them walk on their hind legs. The illustration just below on the same page, "The Tournament," is also remarkably felicitous, the armour of the fairy knights being delineated with the utmost delicacy. Mushrooms and toadstools appear in almost every picture; often to shelter diurnal slumbers, and frequently the elves are using them for a kind of leap-frog. But if anyone wishes to make a closer acquaintance with these true "Pictures from the Elf-world," and to enter fairy-land by the aid of Mr. Doyle's genius, we repeat that they cannot do better than procure the book in all its originalty and beauty for themselves, as no description can convey an adequate idea of its merits. Mr. Allingham's poem is in a manner independent of the illustrations, as these do not profess to follow any connected narrative, but simply to give miscellaneous information concerning fairy manners and customs. The poem on the contrary, though occasionally alluding to the subjects represented in the plates, is a little fairy romance in itself, very pretty in parts, and forming a highly suitable accompaniment to the pictures.

The "Month," November, 1869. London : Simpkin & Marshall.

WE have every reason to hope that our discussions with the "Month"—which have inevitably filled a much larger portion of our two last numbers than we could wish—will not need to be further continued. We will, therefore, but briefly indicate the reply which we should make to our contemporary's last criticisms.

1. We should maintain confidently that in our comments on the "Month" we have said nothing at variance with the due relation between Catholic periodicals, nor anything which, either in itself or its tone, has any tendency to promote undue contention.

2. Coming now to the particular question last discussed, the "Month" is really mistaken in supposing that any writer in the *DUBLIN REVIEW* ever admitted that he had at one time not known of the connection between Catholic colleges and London University; though undoubtedly, for reasons which we gave in July, we preserved a deep silence in January on that connection. In July, 1869, p. 92, the writer referred to used language absolutely inconsistent with the supposition of his ignorance.

3. The writer of our articles for January and July, 1869, was quite aware of the two final Oxford examinations, distinct from "*Literæ humaniores*" and mathematics.

4. We are most happy to repeat emphatically—what we thought had been very clearly expressed in July, p. 92—that our parallel, about Catholics presenting themselves before Calvinistic examiners, applied exclusively to a proposal, in regard to which the "Month" has expressly protested that it was never really made; and that this parallel has not the slightest bearing on what the "Month" really desired.

5. But in July (p. 103) we expressed earnest dissent from this proposal also, though "we had no room to argue for our opinion." We have never as yet, in fact, drawn out the various considerations on which we found this dissent.

6. In July we discussed the question, whether our misapprehension of the "Month's" intended proposal indicated controversial unfairness; and we warmly maintained the negative. We have no wish to continue our argument on this head. But it has been thought that there are certain facts bearing on this question, which we were wrong not expressly to state. We have very great pleasure in supplying the omission, and begging our readers to give these facts the full weight due to them.

(a) The Oxford examinations differ, as a matter of fact, from the London, in not *requiring* philosophy for a degree.

(β) Before last July, nothing was said about Oxford in the "Month" otherwise than incidentally.

(γ) As soon as the "Month" referred at all to what we had said, it did so for the purpose of disclaiming our interpretation of its proposal.

7. So much on our controversy with the "Month." But there is one particular on which we unhesitatingly take to ourselves blame. The "Month" considers, that certain portions of Dr. Gillow's letter which appeared in our October number had some appearance of charging that periodical with consciously stating what was not true. We know, as a matter of fact, that nothing could be further from Dr. Gillow's intention; and we must add that, in our humble judgment, no such charge is conveyed in the legitimate objective sense of Dr. Gillow's words. But we cannot help seeing that it is possible for some readers so to misunderstand one or two sentences. We cannot express too strongly our feeling, on the extreme importance of avoiding in controversy, especially in Catholic controversy, whatever could possibly give such an impression. We much regret therefore, that we did not observe the possibility of such misapprehension, and point it out to Dr. Gillow. It constantly happens that an external observer sees more accurately the possible effect of some expression, than does the writer himself: and we are quite certain that, when he wrote the letter, the possibility never occurred to Dr. Gillow of his being so misapprehended.

The Carlow College Magazine, Nov., 1869. Carlow: Fitzsimons.

THE very able philosophical writer in this magazine is still of opinion, that his words concerning ontologism do not in their legitimate objective sense justify the interpretation which we gave them. He has not yet completed his argument, and we defer its careful consideration until he has done so. Here we will only say, that we shall examine his remarks with the utmost care; and that no false shame shall prevent our admitting ourselves to have been in the wrong, should it so appear.

We are greatly indebted to him for the kind feeling evinced in his very undeserved eulogy of ourselves. Indeed, we have of late been much consoled by finding, in various quite unconnected quarters, a very handsome appreciation of our humble labours in the good cause.

(Note to p. 494 of our last volume.)

We find with much regret that the first paragraph of our notice of Dr. Redmond's Sermon-essays has been understood as intended in an unfriendly sense towards S. Edmund's. Certainly it would be peculiarly ungraceful, for more reasons than one, in the editor of this Review to insert any unfriendly mention of a College, with which he has been intimately connected,

and for whose superiors he entertains the most cordial feelings of respect and regard. We admit that our words were open to misconception ; yet when we exhibit the connection of our thought, they will be seen to run most naturally. We were explaining how it was, that so accomplished a theologian as Dr. Redmond had given up his theological class. S. Edmund's, we said, "is no longer more than a 'petit seminaire'"; consequently no theology is taught there ; and for that reason "Dr. Redmond's theological labours have been brought to an end in the natural course of things." Our own conviction is, that S. Edmund's is a great gainer by the removal of its theological students : but this is not the place for discussing such a theme.

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

APRIL, 1870.

ART. I.—JANUS AND FALSE BRETHREN.

The Pope and the Council. By JANUS. Translated from the German.
London, Oxford, and Cambridge : Rivingtons. 1869.

IN our last number we expressed ourselves strongly on the unscientific character of Janus's volume. It is not too much to say, that 420 pages out of its 425 are purely destructive; are occupied, as has been said, with "bringing accusations of fraud, forgery, ambition, oppression, corrupt teaching in faith and morals, and other charges, against many of the most distinguished Popes, saints, theologians, and ecclesiastical writers."* His readers however desire to know, not what opinions he holds in common with deists and atheists, but what doctrines he embraces as a professing Catholic: in particular they desire to know, what is his precise view on the Church's unity and infallibility.

His volume, taken as it stands, conveys these two propositions: (1) that corporate unity is no essential characteristic of the Church; and (2) that infallibility resides, not in Pope and bishops, but in the body of the faithful. The former of these two propositions is stated a good deal more clearly and expressly than the latter; and indeed no one, merely by reading the passage to which we refer, could have a moment's doubt on its meaning. There has been, says Janus, "since the ninth century," "a transformation" "of the Primacy into the Papacy,—

* This quotation is from F. Keogh's "Specimens of Scientific History from Janus." We received this pamphlet just in time for our last number's notice: but we would once more earnestly press it on our readers' attention. There is a very important distinction, between works depending for their value on *argument*, and those depending for their value on *alleged facts*. If 999 arguments out of 1,000 are bad, the reader can none the less judge the thousandth on its own merits: but if a writer bases his case on *alleged facts*, and his readers find that an indefinite number of these are gross mis-statements,—they can place no reasonable confidence in any one of the rest, until they have themselves examined its evidence. This is the invaluable service which F. Keogh has performed, in regard to those unprincipled writers who have published under the name of "Janus."

the consequences of which have been the splitting up of the previously united Church into three great ecclesiastical bodies, divided and at enmity with each other. The ancient Church found the need of a centre of unity, of a bishop possessed of primatial authority, to whom the oppressed might turn, and by whose powerful intercession they might obtain justice. But when the presidency in the Church became an empire, when in place of the first bishop deliberating and deciding in union with his "brethren" on the affairs of the Church, and setting them the example of submission to her laws, was substituted the despotic rule of an absolute monarch, then the unity of the Church, so firmly secured before, was broken up (p. xxii).

No one, we have said, by merely reading this passage, could have the slightest doubt of its meaning. Janus throughout uses the word "Church" in its ordinary sense, as the society founded by Christ. He had just before said that "the *Church* from the first was founded on the Primacy." In the passage we have cited he adds that "the ancient *Church*" needed "a centre of unity"; that Popes accordingly possessed "a presidency in the *Church*"; that they deliberated with their fellow-bishops, "on the affairs of the *Church*." Concerning "the Church," so understood, he expressly affirms, that at some period since the ninth century her "unity, so firmly secured before, was broken up," and that "the previously united Church" was "*split up* into three great ecclesiastical bodies divided and at enmity with each other." Of all the doctrinal statements in Janus's volume, this was about the most clearly and unmistakably expressed; and our surprise therefore may be imagined, when a letter appeared from Mr. Oxenham in the Catholic papers repudiating our interpretation. This letter may rank among the curiosities of literature; and we should be sorry therefore not to give our readers the benefit of its argumentative portion. The italics are Mr. Oxenham's.

SIR,—My attention has been called to an attack on myself in the current number of the "Dublin Review," in an article on "Janus" (p. 215), which contains two deliberate misstatements, and something very like a third, in the space of two lines.

Referring to a paper of mine in the "Academy" for October, the reviewer says: "Mr. Oxenham comes before the public as *sponsor* for a work which *openly denies* the Church's corporate unity, and counts *Anglicans and Photians* as her members."

1. It is not usual, I apprehend, to speak of the writer of even a favourable review as making himself "sponsor" for the whole work reviewed and every statement contained in it, unless he expressly says so. Very few reviewers probably would choose to be held responsible for every line of a volume of several hundred pages. In this case, moreover, I distinctly stated that I was "analyzing rather than criticising the work" of "Janus," and of course I made no reference to either of the statements fathered upon him by the "Dublin"—for a very sufficient reason.

2. For, secondly, and still more, *neither of those statements is anywhere made by Janus*, directly or indirectly; and I doubt if there is a single living

writer, except the editor of the "Dublin," who would have contrived to extract such a meaning out of the very simple passage he has exclusively relied on for the purpose. "Janus" speaks (Pref., p. xxii. *Eng. Trans.*) of "the splitting up of the previously united Church into three great ecclesiastical bodies, divided and at enmity with each other." This is a bare assertion of a notorious historical fact, and has nothing whatever to do with the doctrinal question of "the Church's corporate unity," or the claims of either the Greek Church (which I suppose is intended by the nickname of "Photians") or the Anglican to form a part of it—questions lying wholly beyond the scope of the writer's argument. It is a simple fact that "the previously united Church" *was* "split up," first by the separation of the Easterns, finally consummated in the eleventh century, and next by the separation, not of "Anglicans" only (that is a gratuitous, not to say absurd gloss, which could never even have occurred to a German author), but of Protestantism *en masse*, i.e., all non-Roman Western Christianity. . . .—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Jan. 11, 1870.

H. N. OXENHAM.

We have omitted the concluding paragraph which is not argumentative, not because it could do us any kind of injury, but for a different reason altogether. Mr. Oxenham quotes certain expressions to the disparagement of our controversial fairness—we must be allowed to think ill-advised expressions—put forth by a distinguished Catholic writer; and for this writer we feel such sincere respect, that we could not bear to involve him for a single moment in any kind of even apparent solidarity with Mr. Oxenham.

On reading Mr. Oxenham's letter, our contributor addressed a reply to the Catholic papers, fully accepting of course Mr. Oxenham's explanation as to *his own* meaning: but expressing himself as slow to believe, that *Janus* could be so utterly imbecile in thought as Mr. Oxenham supposes; that Janus could have failed to *mean* what he so plainly *said*. Mr. Oxenham however, in rejoinder, referred to p. xxvii, in which Janus contrasts "the Catholic Church" with "the religious communities separated from her," and presently includes "the Eastern Church" under this *latter* category. Janus then, it would appear, has contradicted himself point-blank, in two passages only five pages distant from each other. Under these circumstances we willingly give him the benefit of the doubt; and that the rather, because the opinion which we had ascribed to him was the most violently anti-Catholic of all those advocated even by *him*.

But what an exhibition of his intellectual character is thus presented! Janus then, it would appear, used the phrase "the Church" as comprehending modern Quakers and Socinians; as signifying in fact the aggregate of all persons who call themselves followers of Christ. Yet he says that, during the first nine centuries, the Church's "unity" had been "firmly secured," and that the Pope possessed "a presidency in the Church." It is Janus's representation of history then, that Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and Monothelites were all "securely united" with Catholics; that

Popes presided over this happy family ; and that, during the first nine centuries, there was no division whatever among those who called themselves followers of Christ. Of course we know very well that Janus meant nothing of the kind : and since we must now further suppose that he did not mean what he *said*, our necessary conclusion is that the whole passage is a mass of unmeaning nonsense. This forsooth is the writer who talks (p. xxix) of devoting "objective and scientific investigation" to "the weighty questions" which he treats ! Why his whole argumentative character might be destroyed to the satisfaction of all reasonable men, by merely begging them to read p. xxii, and then assuring them that he never intended there to affirm that the Church once lost her corporate unity.

As for Mr. Oxenham at all events,—we have his own testimony, that he so understood Janus's words without losing his intellectual respect for so puzzle-headed a blunderer. In regard to his first accusation against us we may briefly point out, that we had explained very clearly in p. 194 the particular "sponsorship" with which we credited him. He stands sponsor for the (supposed) fact that the writers of Janus are true Catholics, by saying that their work "excludes all possibility of mistake" on the subject. As to our alleged misstatement about Photians* and Anglicans—since Janus had expressly said that the Church had been split up into three bodies, we interpreted his words in the most favourable sense which they legitimately admit. It has been thought by many, that Englishmen as well as Germans have had a share in the authorship of Janus : and we considered that the reference to the "three bodies" gave probability to the supposition.

We may observe by the way that at length we are able to see how it is, that Mr. Oxenham has come to charge us with what he calls "dishonest criticism : " meaning thereby the extreme of controversial unfairness. He must himself be capable of that intellectual self-stultification, which he contemplates acquiescently in Janus. Our theory therefore is this. Mr. Oxenham has a great command of language ; and he is sometimes led away by this facility to indite some sonorous paragraph, which has literally no sense at all. His critics however do not at once apprehend this peculiarity ; and, until they have learned better to appreciate him, they continually fall into the mistake of supposing that in every case he must mean *something or other*. But (by hypothesis) *whatever* intelligible interpretation they ascribe to such an unmeaning paragraph as we have indicated,—he starts back in unaffected surprise,

* Why does Mr. Oxenham describe this word as a "nickname" ? Are we no longer to speak of Arians, Eutychians, Lutherans, Calvinists ? What more appropriate appellation can be given to heretics and schismatics, than that derived from their respective founders ?

and declares that no such proposition was ever in his thoughts. From this he is naturally led one further step. It is far more obvious to suppose that his critics have been guilty of "dishonest criticism," than that his own words have been simple nonsense. Whoever will take the trouble of looking back at our notice of Mr. Oxenham in January, 1866 (pp. 274—281) will see several amusing instances of the characteristic we describe.

However, enough of this. At last, what Janus and Mr. Oxenham lose in intellectual character, they gain in the much more important respect, of lessening the amount of heterodoxy for which they are responsible. And though (as we shall immediately say) we still consider Janus's position to be distinctly and unequivocally heretical, we have much pleasure in withdrawing from our indictment that particular count, which charges him with regarding Photians and Anglicans as included in the Visible Church.

After Mr. Oxenham's letter, we are unable to say with confidence what Janus means to affirm on any imaginable subject. In regard therefore to our next allegation against him—viz. that he vests infallibility not in Pope and bishops but in the body of the faithful—we cannot pretend to say confidently that he intends anything of the kind. He has not denied even Papal infallibility at all more clearly, than he has affirmed the dissolution of the Church's corporate unity: and yet this affirmation turns out to have been entirely at variance with his real opinion. Still, we must provisionally take our interpretation as accurate: and we are the rather disposed to do so, because in *this* particular Mr. Oxenham has not *alleged* that we were mistaken. Before we consider however in whom Janus *vests* infallibility, let us inquire how much he understands to be *included* in that prerogative.

The Church in its totality is secured against false doctrine; it will not fall away from Christ and the Apostles, and will not repudiate the doctrine it has once received, and which has been handed down within it. When a Council passes sentence on doctrine, it thereby gives testimony to its truth. The bishops attest, each for his own portion of the Church, that a certain defined doctrine has hitherto been taught and believed there, or they bear witness that the doctrines hitherto believed involve, as their logical and necessary consequence, some truth which may not yet have been expressly formulated. As to whether this testimony has been rightly given, whether freedom and unbiassed truthfulness have prevailed among the assembled bishops, [this is the only question which has to be considered.] Here, therefore, the certainty and infallibility rest entirely on the solid ground of facts.

The meaning of a judgment passed by the assembled bishops is simply this,—thus have our predecessors believed, thus do we believe, and thus will they that come after us believe. . . . [A great community] being left to itself naturally keeps within the limits of the traditional faith which has been constantly and everywhere received (pp. 411, 412).

Now first observe, how impossible Janus finds it to be consistent with himself even for two consecutive pages. The bishops must "keep *within the limits* of the traditional Faith which has been *constantly and everywhere received*" (p. 412); they must testify "thus have *our predecessors* believed" (*ib.*): yet on the other hand they can infallibly define truths, which follow from revealed dogmata by "*logical and necessary consequence*" (p. 411). Surely when they define certain newly-observed *consequences* of revealed truth, they can no longer testify "thus have our predecessors believed"; nor yet are they keeping "within the limits of what has constantly been received."

Yet on one point Janus does avoid self-contradiction: for he consistently says that infallibility extends no further than to the testification of truths, which are already universally received by Catholics throughout the orbis terrarum. He adds also almost in so many words—what is of itself abundantly plain—that for such infallibility as this, no supernatural intervention whatever is required: such infallibility "rests entirely on the solid ground of facts"; and consists merely in testifying a visible phenomenon, which no one in his senses can possibly deny. According to Janus, the Church is infallible in declaring Catholic dogma, no otherwise than mankind is infallible in declaring that fire burns and that night succeeds day. Each man testifies for himself, that such is his experience: and in like manner, according to Janus, all which happens in a *council* is, that each bishop testifies for himself the existence of such and such beliefs throughout his diocese.

But let this view be accepted, and we do not see how any council which ever sat can be accounted infallible in its most important and critical judgments; however cordially (to use Janus's phrase) the Church may have afterwards accepted its decrees. Take the first of all, the Nicene. Indubitably the 318 Fathers "attested, each for his own portion of the Church, that" the dogma denied by Arius "had hitherto been taught and believed there." But they also took a very important *further* step; and *unless* they had taken it, they would have done nothing worthy of mention towards protecting the Deposit. They acted, not only as *witnesses* of a *dogma*, but as *judges* on the propriety of a *term*. They infallibly decided, under the Holy Ghost's assistance, that the word "Homousion" was an appropriate *expression*, for the Catholic verity which had been assailed. This was no matter of *testimony* at all: no one has ever pretended, that the term sanctioned at Nicæa had hitherto been in universal use. If therefore, as Janus's words imply, a Council never becomes infallible except so far as it has *testified* an indubitable *fact*, the Nicene Council was not infallible in the one most essential and vital portion of its dogmatic proceeding. And our remarks apply, not to the Nicene

only, but to every Council in the Church's history which ever put forth a dogmatic definition. The *infallibility* of such a definition precisely means, that the bishops have not merely *testified* infallibly the universal belief in this or that dogma, but have *judged* infallibly on its true analysis and expression.

We pass to another particular. "Theologians and canonists declare that without *complete freedom* the assembly is only a pseudo-Synod" (p. 425). But just before he had said (p. 424) that "even at Trent the results of a want of freedom have been displayed." The Council of Trent then was, in Janus's judgment, "only a pseudo-Synod." But in fact Janus leaves his readers in doubt, whether a true Œcumenical Council has ever been held since the Church was founded. "In early times . . . it was the Emperors who sometimes trenched too closely on this freedom: but from Gregory VII.'s time [he does not say *Saint* Gregory VII.] the weight of Papal power has pressed ten times more heavily" (ib.). Neither earlier nor later councils then have been certainly Œcumenical. As to the Vatican Council, Janus tells us beforehand that under no circumstances will he regard it as Œcumenical: "*whatever* course the Synod may take, one quality can *never* be predicated of it; namely that it has been a really free Council" (ib.).

This is the book for which Mr. Oxenham has stood sponsor; the book of which he has gravely stated, that "its writers are careful to exclude all possibility of mistake as to the fact" of their being Catholics. It is not our present purpose however to say more of such disgraceful statements as we have now placed before our readers; we mean disgraceful as coming from professed children of the Church: we think it more important to dwell on a different error,—not more serious indeed than these—but more dangerous, because more peculiarly in harmony with the worst tendencies of our time. We refer to Janus's doctrine, that infallibility resides, not in Pope and bishops, but in the body of believers. He expresses this as distinctly as he ever expresses any doctrine whatever.* In early centuries, he says (p. 78), "the force and authority of councils depended on the consent of the Church as expressed in the synod, and afterwards on the fact of *its being generally received*." Again (p. 411) as to whether the "bishops assembled" in council have "rightly given their testimony"—"on that point *the Church herself is the ultimate judge* by her acceptance or rejection of the council or its decision." We understand him to mean here by the word "Church"—as his context implies—not what Catholics call the "*Ecclesia Docens*," but the "*cœtus fidelium*." We so interpreted

* Unless indeed when he says the contradictory of what he means: for in that case, as we have seen, he manages to speak with quite exceptional clearness.

him in our last number (p. 193), and Mr. Oxenham on *this* point has made no protest. We may add that Mr. Oxenham himself on a former occasion used similar language, as we pointed out in July, 1966 (p. 245). We understood him to speak of the "sensus fidelium" as the Church's ultimate guarantee for the dogma of the Immaculate Conception; nor has he ever alleged that we understood him wrongly.* Mr. Renouf again, in his first pamphlet on Pope Honorius (p. 34, note), called it "the *old view*, that both Popes and Councils may err, and that the Church alone is infallible": and though we have twice called his attention to the circumstance that these words will naturally be understood as vesting infallibility in the body of the faithful, he has never disowned the tenet. On the whole then, we fear there can be no doubt that this doctrine is professed by certain soi-disant Catholics.

In our last number (pp. 205-6) we exhibited the extravagant contradiction to the most obvious historical facts, which is involved in such a tenet. Our present concern is with the judgment which must be formed of it by true Catholics.

We must maintain then—speaking entirely under correction—that it is not merely a heresy, such e.g. as the Arian or Nestorian, but that it is in some sense the very embodied principle of heresy. Ask a well-instructed Catholic what constitutes a heresy,—and he will reply, that heresy is involved in the denial of any dogma, which Pope and bishops unite in teaching as revealed truth. Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians and the rest were heretics, because on one particular point they so offended. But the false brethren whom we are now criticising, refuse intellectual submission to Pope and bishops, not on *one particular* dogmatic question, but on *all dogmatic questions without exception*: whatever dogma they may happen to regard as revealed, their reason for so regarding it is not the proposition of the Ecclesia Docens, but some different ground altogether. No one can be surprised therefore at the truly remarkable severity of language used towards such persons, in the memorial, signed at Rome in January by so many bishops, and invoking a definition of Pontifical infallibility. This memorial will be seen entire in another part of our present number. There are men, it says, "who boast indeed of the Catholic name," but "abuse that name to the ruin (perniciem) of those weak in faith." Certain persons "calling themselves Catholics" are "most bitter opponents

* These were his words. "When Anglicans become aware how completely the recent definition—apart from any question about the binding authority of Papal Bulls as such—was endorsed or rather anticipated by the verdict of the *sensus fidelium*, they will not be unwilling to accept it 'as a doctrine.'" Mr. Oxenham assigned this as the reason, why the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception should not prevent Anglicans from uniting themselves with the Roman Catholic Church.

of Catholic doctrine." Among those who "in external action" unite themselves to the Church, there are some who have "interiorly deserted her," and "made shipwreck concerning the Faith."

Nay in one respect, as we venture to think, this episcopal memorial *understates* the open contumacy of which such persons must be guilty, if they have (as the French say) the courage of their opinions, and act consistently with their profession. The memorial says that such men would receive Pontifical ex cathedrâ decrees with "respectful silence"; but (so far as we can see) they are bound by their view to the very contrary. Let us make e.g. a very probable supposition: viz., that the Vatican Council shall put forth this or that doctrinal determination utterly repugnant to their opinions, and that the Holy Father shall confirm such determination. It will at once be their duty (if they remain fixed in their deplorable principles) to make manifest before the whole world, that such determination has not been endorsed by the *sensus fidelium*. It will be their duty therefore, not only to cry aloud themselves, but to stir up other (so-called) Catholics to cry aloud also; to protest with unmistakeable urgency, both against the determination itself and against the authority from which it has issued. Such are the pleasant prospects of harmony and peace, presented to the Church by these peace-loving gentlemen.

This then is the Church's present calamity; and there is no use blinking the fact. One cannot, as the proverbial ostrich attempts to do, prevent the existence of facts by ignoring them; and it is better therefore to look them in the face. There are enemies and traitors in the camp. It is not from Protestants only but from men kneeling at the same altars as himself, that the Catholic has to dread the poisoning of his faith. And such assaults are of course the more formidable, for the very reason that he is not duly on his guard against their malignity. In number indubitably these false brethren constitute no more than a small and insignificant clique. But they are energetic, zealous, and restless; and though their intellectual power is sometimes absurdly overrated, they comprise one or two really able and learned men in their number.

Further—though there are very few indeed calling themselves Catholics who would advocate the heretical tenet which we have been denouncing—a very far larger number (as often happens in similar cases) are imbued in greater or less degree with the *savour* of that heresy. Very few will have the hardihood to hold, that on *revealed dogmata* it is the Church's subjects who are to instruct the Church's rulers; that it is for the flock to guide their shepherds along the path marked out by Christ. But the number is not so small of Catholics, who (with more or less disguise) use similar language, in regard to doctrines which are not actually enforced by the Church as of faith. We are referring to doctrines which, though

not enforced as of faith, may be really an integral portion of the Deposit; and which at all events are most closely connected therewith, and fall within what theologians call the "*materia fidei et morum*." Such doctrines refer to the State's duty towards true religion; or to the evils resulting from a free press; or to the grievous spiritual injury involved in unguarded familiarity with non-Catholic literature;* or to the calamitousness of mixed education. It is not so very rare to find a Catholic who (either consciously or more often unconsciously), on such matters as these, considers the Church's teaching to be imbecile and retrograde; and who thinks that, in his quality of educated Englishman and man of the world, he has a mission to enlighten those teachers and to direct those pastors, who have received their authority over him directly from God.

Then as to things philosophical. It is of course the business of a true Catholic philosopher, to contemplate most carefully at starting the various beacons raised by the Church for the purpose of guarding him against error, and sedulously to direct his course by the light of their salutary guidance. But it is far from uncommon, we incline to think, even with excellently-intentioned Catholics, to act unreflectingly in a very different spirit. In the first instance perhaps they direct their *unassisted* private judgment to the investigation of philosophical truth; and then aim at bringing the Church's decisions into harmony with their independently obtained conclusions. Instead of themselves rising up towards the Church, they try rather to drag the Church down towards themselves. All this involves the (conscious or unconscious) assumption, that, on matters importantly connected with revealed truth, the judgment of Pope and bishops need not be a Catholic's supreme and irreformable guide.

To say truth, this disloyalty towards the *Ecclesia Docens* seems to us the one chief intellectual peril of our time. Catholics are not now menaced by special heresy or false theological dogma—such as the Arianism or Lutheranism or Jansenism of the past—but on the one hand by a destructive and atheistically tending philosophy; and on the other hand by that subtle and most poisonous influence, which may be called in brief the spirit of the age. It is now so common a remark as to have become quite common-place, that man's ultimate intellectual battle will be, between the Church on one side, and the combined forces of liberalism, indifferentism, atheism, on the other. But in respect to numbers, plausibility, loud-

* We will once more place before our readers a passage, extracted from the "*Month*" for last May (p. 421). No one considers the "*Month*" eccentric or extreme; and we are the more desirous therefore of drawing attention to its emphatic testification. It speaks of the "*books and newspapers and magazines which Catholics too often think themselves at liberty to read*"; and adds that in consequence, if they have not been guarded by a careful Catholic education, "*they will stand in proximate danger of losing the Faith.*"

ness of declamation, worldly influence, these combined hosts will be in a position of enormous superiority. Wherein on the contrary, lies *the Church's* intellectual strength? Precisely in the *consistency* of her antagonism to omnigenous error. When the time of deadly conflict therefore arrives,—and no one can guess how soon that may be—it is of most vital moment, that Catholics shall be united as one man in the attitude they assume against the sophistries of the moment. If battle is to be given against liberalism and indifferentism, those who fight must themselves be free from all taint of the same evil principles. Let the Catholic intellectual ranks be encumbered by the presence of mutually conflicting and antagonistic elements, the powers of darkness will win an easy victory. It is a matter then of unspeakable urgency, that the evil leaven be thoroughly purged from out the Catholic body.

But how is so essential a work to be accomplished? We know of no other method than that appointed by God Himself: viz., the flock's humble submission to the guidance of its pastors. Now the Church and the world are ever internecine enemies. Let educated Catholics therefore shrink with watchful jealousy from the contamination of that worldly atmosphere with which they are on all sides surrounded; let them study carefully the various Apostolic Letters and Allocutions, put forth by Pius IX. and confirmed by the Catholic episcopate, against "the chief errors of our most unhappy age"; let them add to this an equally reverential study of the Vatican decrees as they successively appear; in one word let them labour in every attainable way to imbue their mind and heart with every discoverable exhibition of the Church's spirit, in regard to present errors and perils. This, as it seems to us, is the one all-important intellectual lesson of the period; and it is this therefore on which we have laid more stress than on any other in the whole conduct of our REVIEW.

We find however that some excellent persons, who substantially agree with us on the question of doctrine, regret and condemn the zeal and persistency with which we have harped upon this string; because, as they think, our course has fostered disunion among Catholics and otherwise perplexed and injured souls. We have such unfeigned respect for these critics, that we cannot differ from them without self-mistrust; and we have been so far impressed by their objections as carefully to reconsider our whole ground. We confess however that such consideration has but added strength to our previous convictions. So far as we can trust our own judgment, it seems to us most manifest that by no other course could we have duly contended against the Church's enemies. But we have again and again declared, that we altogether *shrink* from following our own judgment on such a question as this; and that we have made it our principal concern to look for guidance where alone on earth it

can be securely found, viz. to the Holy See. On former occasions we have adduced various testimonies of the Holy Father, which appear to us simply decisive: but since our last number we have observed a fact stated in the Ghent "Bien Public" of Jan. 4, with which we were entirely unacquainted, and which we are sure our readers will thank us for bringing before their notice. Three editors of the Belgian "Catholique" (laymen) addressed a letter to the Holy Father, containing these words: we italicise those to which we would draw especial attention.

Assured as we are that the only efficacious mode for resisting the propagation of pernicious doctrines resides in the firm resolve of individuals to *receive, respect and put in practice the teachings of the Holy See*, we have particularly applied ourselves to the *inculcating and enforcing by example and exhortation respect to those august instructions*. . . . In order to treat the political and social questions which occupy man's mind *we have always taken for our guide the standard of the Ecclesia Docens and the decisions emanating from your infallible authority.*

The writers add that many Catholics have been displeased with the course they have taken, and solicit express guidance. And the Holy Father in reply, by a Letter dated Nov. 4, 1868, warmly congratulated them on the course they had taken: a course, he added, in which it was necessary for them to contend, not only against the enemy, but *also and often against brethren*.*

* We subjoin the whole passage as it stands in the "Bien Public." The italics are not ours.

Pour apprécier la portée du Bref du 4 novembre 1868, il convient de connaître dans quels termes la question était posée. Le Bref du Saint-Père répondait à une lettre que lui avaient adressée trois rédacteurs du *Catholique*, simples laïques tous trois, jeunes d'années et jeunes journalistes. Ils disaient :

"Assurés que le seul moyen efficace de résister à la propagation des doctrines pernicieuses réside dans la fidélité des âmes à recevoir, à respecter et à mettre en pratique les enseignements du Saint-Siège, nous nous sommes particulièrement appliqués à inculquer et à fortifier, par l'exemple et par l'exhortation, le respect de ces augustes enseignements. Telle a été la pensée qui a déterminé la fondation de notre Revue et en a sans cesse inspiré la rédaction. Pour traiter les questions politiques et sociales qui préoccupent le plus les esprits, spécialement dans notre patrie, nous avons toujours pris pour guide le flambeau de l'Eglise enseignante et les décisions émanées de votre infallible autorité.

"Le caractère que nous avons imprimé à notre publication a attiré sur elle de nombreuses contradictions, non-seulement de la part des ennemis de notre foi, mais souvent aussi de la part de plusieurs catholiques; qui, tout en conservant un attachement sincère et dévoué à la cause de la religion, n'entendent la servir et la voir servir que par des procédés plus indirects, et supportent avec une certaine impatience l'exposition et le développement des majestueuses sévérités de la doctrine. Nous avons eu à nous défendre, contre leurs critiques, du reproche de troubler l'uniformité de l'influence

There are two different objections raised on grounds of expediency, against a course of conduct so earnestly encouraged by the Holy See. Firstly some excellent persons fear lest the Church should be weakened by any public exhibition of disunion among Catholics. But we reply with much confidence—in accordance with our previous remarks—that the Church's strength consists, not in *illusory* but in *real* union. Now never were Catholic bishops more firmly united than at the present moment both with each other and with their visible head; and the one sure way therefore of promoting true Catholic union, is to insist energetically on the authority of the *Ecclesia Docens*.

Secondly objectors consider that great injury is done to *souls* by this domestic conflict. Now certainly we are the very last to deny that souls do suffer most grievous injury from the existing state of

chrétienne sur les affaires publiques, en soutenant des opinions isolées et impopulaires.”

Nous n'avons pas jugé nécessaire de souligner dans ce passage les expressions qui se rapportent le plus directement à la présente discussion et qui en marquent les aspects particuliers et les nuances. Le lecteur saura bien les entendre. Ne croirait-on pas que notre lettre au Saint-Père a été écrite hier et, comme disent les gens de justice, *pour les besoins de la cause* ?

Or, voici ce que le Souverain Pontife nous répondit :

“ *Des opinions équivoques et captieuses ont été introduites il y a longtemps par une fausse philosophie et propagées par les charmes trompeurs de la liberté. Répandues davantage et fortifiées par une suite continuelle d'événements désordonnés, elles n'ont pas seulement ouvert à l'impiété et à la révolte une large voie, mais, ce qui n'est peut-être pas moins affligeant, elles ont envahi aussi un grand nombre d'esprits pieux. . . .* Ainsi, par leur exemple et leur autorité, ils amènent les autres à ces opinions, ils développent les mauvais germes cachés en eux, et semant de divisions contrairement à leurs sentiments et à leurs intentions, ils affaiblissent des forces qu'il faudrait diriger unanimes et réunies contre l'ennemi commun.

“ Nous nous réjouissons donc de ce que, dans le combat que vous avez entrepris contre les ennemis de la religion et de l'autorité, vous avez pris pour règle de suivre fidèlement les enseignements de ce Saint-Siège *et de les exposer dans la pureté de leur sens originnaire, afin que le peuple se pénètre de la vraie et saine doctrine* et apprenne à connaître la perfidie cachée des formules qui, plus qu'aux autres époques, flattent si insidieusement les penchants et les convoitises de notre âge. Et nous vous félicitons de ce que, sans vous laisser abattre, vous souteniez un combat déjà long, dans lequel il faut lutter non-seulement contre l'ennemi, *mais encore et souvent contre des frères. . . .* ”

Ces paroles du Saint-Père ne répondent-elles pas à toutes les objections ? Le Pape s'adresse à de simples laïques, à des journalistes. Il constate que ces journalistes traitent les questions les plus graves et les plus délicates, puisque bien des catholiques sincères s'y égarent, au grand détriment de l'Eglise. Il constate que ces mêmes journalistes discutent sur le sens et la portée des enseignements du siège apostolique, non-seulement contre les ennemis de la foi, mais encore contre d'autres catholiques. Et il les approuve non-seulement “ d'inculquer ces enseignements par l'exemple et par l'exhortation,” mais de les interpréter et de rétablir contre l'ignorance et le sophisme leur sens originnaire et leur sens exact : *nativum ac sincerum sensum*.

things : but that from which they suffer is the deplorable fact, that such habits of thought as we have been deprecating are to be found within the Church. This however is a fact for which no one will account the DUBLIN REVIEW responsible. The practical question which we have had to consider is, whether souls receive greater injury from the utterance of vehement protest against anti-Catholic habits of thought, than would result if such habits were allowed to exercise their poisonous influence unchallenged and unchecked. We confess ourselves surprised that, among good Catholics, there can have been any hesitation on the true answer to this question. No one e.g. will doubt (to take the first instance which occurs to our mind out of the thousand presented by ecclesiastical history) that very serious injury accrued to souls, from the protests against Nestorius's teaching which the orthodox members of his flock so energetically and clamorously issued. But still less will any Catholic question, that this injury was as nothing, when compared with the awful disasters which must have ensued, had the heresy been allowed to run a long course without exposure and opposition. Yet neither in the case of Nestorianism nor in any other which can be named is the connection more manifest (in most cases it is less manifest) between evil *doctrine* and *spiritual* calamity, than in the instance of that particular heretical tendency which we have been considering throughout this article.

We do not for a moment forget that, in this instance as in others, an individual's pious instincts may, and very often do, indefinitely neutralize the legitimate results of anti-Catholic doctrine : and what we are going to say, must be entirely understood with this explanation. But it is indubitable that there is a certain moral pestilence called "worldliness" ; nor do we see how on reflection good men can doubt that, so far as it exists among Catholics, it has a most intimate connection with these unorthodox views of doctrine. If piety is based, as on its very foundation, on a practical appreciation of the importance respectively attributable to things temporal and things eternal, then the spiritual evil of even modified (religious) liberalism is very serious. We have been enforcing prominently in our present article, as is especially the province of a public writer, the calamitous influence of that evil principle on the Church's practical action. But no less heavy and no less well grounded an accusation may be brought against it, on the ground of its intrinsic tendency towards corrupting and degrading the individual soul.

ART. II.—INDIAN THEISM.

1. *The Brahmo Somaj Vindicated.* Being the substance of a Lecture delivered extempore at the Calcutta Brahmo Somaj Hall, 18th April, 1863. Second edition. Calcutta. 1868.
2. *A Defence of Brahmoism and the Brahmo Somaj.** Being a Lecture delivered in Midnapore Somaj Hall on the 21st June, 1863. Midnapore. 1863.
3. *Jesus Christ ; Europe and Asia.* Being the substance of a Lecture delivered extempore in the theatre of the Calcutta Medical College, on Saturday, 5th May, 1866. Third edition. Calcutta. 1869.
4. *Great Men.* Being the substance of a Lecture delivered extempore at the Town Hall, Calcutta, on the 28th September, 1866. Calcutta. 1868.
5. *A Brief History of the Calcutta Brahmo Somaj, from January, 1830, the Date of its Foundation, to December, 1867.* Calcutta. 1868.
6. *Regenerating Faith.* Being the substance of a Sermon preached on the occasion of the Thirty-eighth Anniversary of the Brahmo Somaj, or Theistic Church in India, on Friday, 24th January, 1868. Calcutta. 1868.
7. *Deism and Theism ; or, Rationalism and Faith.* Written on the occasion of the Thirty-ninth Anniversary of the Brahmo Somaj, Saturday, the 23rd January, 1869. Calcutta. 1869.
8. *The Future Church.* Being the substance of a Lecture delivered on the occasion of the Thirty-ninth Anniversary of the Brahmo Somaj, in the Town Hall, Calcutta, on Saturday, the 23rd January, 1869. Calcutta. 1869.

IN a previous article on the Religious Tendencies of India,† we endeavoured to trace the effects of English literature and English education on the people of India generally, and indirectly on the position and prospects of Christian missions, both Catholic and Protestant. The conclusions which we arrived at were that the old conditions of missionary success are rapidly becoming obsolete ; that even now Rationalism, Deism, and Materialism are greater obstacles to conversions in India than caste or Hindoo superstitions ; that while the force of the latter is visibly declining, that of the former is as visibly on the increase ; that Protestantism has long since effected a change of front, and adapted its operations to the new state of religious opinions, so that its ill success

* The vernacular words are variously rendered into English either as Brahma Samaj, Brahma Sumaj, or Brahmo Somaj. The former is the most correct, the latter the most common. The pamphlets enumerated adopt sometimes one, sometimes another method of orthography. To avoid confusion we have preferred invariably to follow the more common form.

† No. 26, October, 1869.

is mainly due to its own deficiencies and inconsistencies ; while Catholicity, chiefly in consequence of the impediments and disadvantages under which it has laboured, has hitherto failed to make any adequate appeal to the educated and semi-educated classes. We also gave an account of the Brahmo Somaj, or Theistic Church, a body which, though only numbering some 2,000 adherents, has attracted great attention* from its forming an organized nucleus, more or less sympathized with by scores of thousands of unattached Theists throughout the country.

On the present occasion we propose to devote our attention more exclusively to the character of Indian Theism, and the principles which the followers of the Brahmo Somaj (the only Theists who attempt to state and systematize any positive principles) profess to have adopted. Were it our object merely to classify and analyze the opinions of a numerically small section of an Oriental community, it might reasonably be maintained that the subject is worthy of the attention of all religious people in this country, more emphatically so when the section in question is entirely the creation of English rule and education ; but we may also base our claim as to the importance of the subject on more general grounds than this. Theism in India is in many respects only an anticipation of a phase of opinion which is every day becoming more and more predominant in European countries, a state of things for which Catholics in England as well as on the Continent must prepare themselves. We lay no claim to originality in enforcing this argument. The illustrious American convert, Dr. Brownson, insisted many years ago on the urgency of adapting controversy to meet the Rationalistic and Deistic point of view, instead of almost exclusively the Protestant ; but there is so much in the present state of religious parties in England, and even abroad, to concentrate the energies of Catholics on converting, or at least confuting Christian heresy in its more positive forms, that it cannot be inexpedient to draw attention from time to time to the fact that though anti-Catholicism is and will be as rampant as ever, the day of Protestantism *as a doctrinal system* is at an end, and in controversy with the better educated classes at least, we must be prepared to rest no argument *ad hominem* on any Christian principle or doctrine as such.

Indian Theism suffers, it is true, under one disqualification for being accepted as a specimen of what will one day be the chief opponent of the Catholic Church elsewhere, in that many of its ideas and opinions are stamped with national and Hindoo origin ;

* An article on the subject appeared in a recent number of the "British Quarterly Review," to which we referred in our last article. Since then the "Contemporary Review" of February has devoted an article to this society, under the heading "Indian Theism and its Relation to Christianity."

that it is greatly influenced by Hindoo traditions, even where it professes to have discarded and condemned them. But to counter-balance this, it offers an advantage for purposes of analysis which can be found in perhaps no other country at the present day; viz., that its adherents, while educated in the intellectual atmosphere of modern sciences and civilization, have not been educated in Christianity, and consequently have not abandoned or turned away from it—it is hardly too much to say have never even been confronted with it in its most rational and consistent form.

We must endeavour, even at the risk of appearing to be discursive, to justify the importance which we attach to this distinction. It is almost self-evident that it is not the proximity of a person's opinions to the doctrines of the Catholic Church, but the moral attitude of his intellect, which renders his conversion more or less hopeful and his state of mind relatively more or less acceptable to God. An Evangelical who, on the occasion of some doctrinal controversy among his own party, asks himself whether, after all, it is not more conformable to Scripture and reason to admit a final and authoritative judge of controversy, and sincerely follows up the train of thought thus aroused, is probably much nearer the truth than an Anglo-Catholic who prays to the Saints, goes to confession, and talks of the undivided Church of the first eight centuries, but at the same time eagerly fraternizes with the disloyal members of the Roman obedience, and hunts up, with almost feverish anxiety, any fact or fiction tending to its disadvantage. Still the human mind, when in a state of inquiry and doubt, generally accepts principles or truths gradually, requires to *realize* one truth before it is able to build upon it the others which properly follow from it: it is found therefore in a country like England at the present day, where almost every one is trained to accept Christianity in some shape or other when young, that those who use their free will to give play to the better promptings of their intellect, are drawn on to sympathize with the more dogmatic forms of Protestantism until they are brought face to face with Catholicity; while those who listen favourably to the arguments which eventually land the mind in unbelief, become at an early stage latitudinarians. Hence, though it by no means follows that all Anglo-Catholics (as they are called) are on the way to the Church, the converse may be maintained as approximately true, that most persons on their way to the Church first become Anglo-Catholics, and, as a consequence, a tendency naturally arises among Catholics to regard those who hold High Church opinions as almost the only promising subjects for conversion, an impression which may be not unfounded now in England, but which is very incorrect if accepted in the abstract, or applied to other countries not similarly circumstanced, and which exercises an unfortunate tendency to restrict

the efforts of the best Catholic writers to only one among many important branches of controversy.

It has often been said, as for instance by Dr. Newman in the "Apologia," "that there is no medium in true philosophy between Atheism and Catholicity, and that a perfectly consistent mind, under those circumstances in which it finds itself here below, must embrace either the one or the other."* On the other hand, it is also frequently held by Catholics that Deism is a consistent form of belief: these apparently contradictory opinions seem to us to be both of them perfectly true and reconcilable. Two radically opposed sets of intellectual principles are constantly appealing to every individual, the one predisposing him to accept, the other to reject divine truth. If a person yields himself to the influence of the former, his bias is to accept the most affirmative form of religion which is practically presented to him, provided its foundation is sufficiently reasonable. If, however, he abandons himself a prey to the latter influence, his bias is to the most negative form of religion which he finds current around him. Opinions on religious problems may, we think, be broadly divided into four great classes. 1. Total scepticism, or non-theism.† 2. Belief in a God and natural religion. 3. Belief in a supernatural revelation. 4. Belief in a divinely-commissioned institution, the custodian and judge of a revelation. Each of these classes may, of course, be subdivided into many sections. Now we most strongly insist on the truth of the principle that the very same kind of arguments, the same train of thought, which lead a man to prefer Theism to scepticism should also predispose him to believe in the existence of a revelation; and again, when consistently carried forward, to accept the claim of an institution to be the custodian and judge of revelation. The evidence varies, no doubt, in degree and cogency, in its different details, but the total effect of it is approximately the same in each case. To any one who is prepared to concede this, it is evident that a man may consistently remain a Theist *if* not fairly confronted with a revelation which, like Christianity, can be reasonably advocated; but if perfectly honest and consistent, his constant attitude towards revelation should be that of the ancient Patriarchs towards the Messiah,—he should feel his own state to be one of imperfection and unsatisfied want, and a revelation to have, at the least, a strong antecedent probability in its favour.

Now an *English* Theist has almost invariably fallen from a more dogmatic form of religion to his present position; he has usually

* Page 322.

† This is what Dr. Newman no doubt means by Atheism. Atheism, as conveying a *positive* conclusion that there is no God, is very rare, and glaringly unreasonable.

surrendered his intellect to the ascendancy of those principles which turn the mind away from faith. Speaking generally, therefore, the common experience which shows that converts to the Faith, or at least educated converts, are comparatively more numerous among the High Church than among any other section of non-Catholic Christians, is justified by this theory, for by casting in their lot with that party they have indicated their adhesion to a class of principles which leads to the Church; and, provided its claims are adequately presented to them, they, humanly speaking, only require humility, consistency, and self-denial enough to accept them.

To this rule, however, there is one class of persons, even in England, who form a decided exception; they are those who are blessed, or, as some would say, cursed, with minds of a highly logical character. Protestantism, or rather non-Catholic Christianity, in so far as it is the belief in a supernatural revelation, is rational and consistent; it is by the rejection of Catholicity that it involves itself in inextricable contradiction. For, to any clear-headed thinker, the advantage (to use the mildest term) of a living institution, the judge of revelation, as its *columna et firmamentum*, is so obvious, that the *à priori* rejection of it as improbable, conflicts with the *à priori* acceptance of revelation as probable. And, on the other hand, when the authorities of that revelation, whether Scripture or tradition, are examined, the *evidence* for the existence of such an institution is so cogent that the rejection of it, as is well pointed out by Mr. Pye in his excellent little book, "The Religion of Common Sense," involves the invalidation of all the testimony by which the revelation itself is supported. Now, virtuous and pious persons who are severely logical, if imbued with the tradition that it is a first principle that Rome is certainly wrong, are often impelled by the mere force of logic in the direction of latitudinarianism, without thereby ceasing to be in a manner pious or virtuous; and if anything can be done to shake their first principle, they are able at once, without any transitional stage, to find repose in Catholicity, and "the world is astonished with the tidings that such an one, whom they took for a sceptic, has 'gone over to Rome.'"^{*}

Now the main object of this digression is to indicate the light in which Catholics ought to regard the more earnest and sincere Indian Theists. There is a far greater presumption of their being in good faith and open to conversion to the truth than can be extended to persons in England who hold opinions very nearly identical with them. Orientals are naturally more logical than Englishmen, and while they have rarely had any occasion, or even opportunity, of making inquiries into the claims of Catholicity, their education has, strange as it may seem, impregnated them with most of

* Pye's Religion of Common Sense, p. 43.

the anti-Catholic prejudices and exaggerations which disfigure ordinary Protestant controversy. In India, as in England, Catholic missionaries have therefore a double task,—to combat and dissipate anti-Catholic prejudices, and to exhibit the Catholic system in the rational and consistent light which properly belongs to it. While, however, the ends in the two countries are nearly identical, the means of attaining them are totally different. A prejudice against some Catholic doctrine, such as the intercession of the Saints, the efficacy of relics, or confession and priestly absolution, is commonly derived, partly from the fact of the doctrine attacked being stated in a perverted or distorted form, but partly also from its repugnance, even when reduced to its proper limits, to human pride and self-sufficiency. A Catholic controversialist generally combats the latter element most successfully by showing that the disputed doctrine is either explicitly declared, or at least justified in principle by Scripture. This, however, to educated Hindoos, is obviously worse than useless. As a rule, they do not trouble themselves to inquire whether Catholics or Protestants are the more *orthodox* Christians; their view of Christianity is ordinarily this, that Christ was a great man, but yet only a man, and a fallible man; that in the main His teaching was good, moral, and laudable, but that it was nevertheless interspersed with error natural to a man, who must be more or less influenced by time, place, country, and circumstances. It is so constantly dinned into their ears, that they often accept it as certain that the Reformation was in many respects a return to primitive Christianity; but they nevertheless have no difficulty in admitting that in some instances, even where it has reformed for the better, it has reformed the Christianity of Christ as well as that of the Church of the sixteenth century.* To show, therefore, that

* "If no new religious or moral truth has been discovered since the time of Christ, another sort of discovery has been made, that is, that of the erroneousness of some of the beliefs of Christ, such as those in the propriety of asceticism, in the existence of devils and the efficiency of exorcism, and in the occurrence of the universal dissolution in His own generation. Among these beliefs I desire to dwell a little on the first of them, that is, His belief in the propriety of leading an ascetical mode of life. Christ, though perhaps the greatest religious genius the world has ever seen, was still an ascetic, like those commonly met with in Asiatic countries. His not recognizing His mother when others pointed her out to Him, and His enjoining His disciples not to care for to-morrow's food or raiment; in short, the general mode of life which He led, followed afterwards by His disciples, proves that He was an ascetic. Now this asceticism has been relaxed in Protestant countries, although it exists in its integrity in Roman Catholic countries, which are in this respect more Christian than the former." (A Defence of Brahmoism and the Brahmo Somaj, p. 13.) This was probably intended to refer to a passage in a pastoral letter of the amiable and much-lamented late Protestant Bishop of Calcutta, Dr. Cotton, issued in 1859, in which, after referring to certain charges of over-indulgence made against the Anglican clergy in the

what is considered a Catholic error is derived from Scripture, only seems to such men to point out one more error in Scripture, and therefore it is by an appeal to reason, natural religion, and the moral sense, that the doctrine, after being cleared of misconception, must be vindicated. In the same way, as regards positive evidence, modern English Catholic controversy almost exclusively proceeds on the principle of assuming the truth of Christianity, and proving (as it can do with unimpeachable cogency) that Catholicity is the only system which can correspond with even the broad outlines of true Christianity as set forth in the teaching of Christ and His Apostles ; but though it is no doubt important to satisfy even Hindoos that the Catholic Church is the legitimate development of the teaching of Christ instead of a corruption of it, this is obviously insufficient to convince them of its truth ; what are still needed are arguments deduced from natural religion and reason, and these, as a rule, receive too little attention, not only from Catholic missionaries in India, but even from Catholics in general ; and hence many yearnings and aspirations for the truth, full of promise, and containing in them the germs of Catholicity, are nipped in the bud, and die of atrophy in the uncongenial atmosphere of Rationalism and Protestantism by which they are surrounded.

The primary truth then which Catholics must keep in view in combating opinions such as those we are examining is that, though Theists in Europe are generally persons who have fallen to that position from a more positive form of religion, and whom, therefore, further controversy will probably only impel to the deeper descents involved in a more consistent realization of the

"Calcutta Review," he says, "You may answer that *asceticism is no part of the Gospel system.*" Mr. Marshall well contrasts with this *ex cathedra* utterance of the Anglican prelate the eloquent passage on the same subject in Father Faber's "Bethlehem," pp. 145-6. "There were five spiritual presences in the Cave of Bethlehem. . . . They were Poverty, Abandonment, Rejection, Secrecy, and Mortification. They started with the infant Jesus from the Cave, and they went with Him to the Tomb. They are stern powers, and their visages unlovely, and their voices harsh, and their company unwelcome to the natural man ; but to the eye which grace has cleansed they are beautiful exceedingly, and their solemnity inviting, and their spells, like those of earthly love, making the heart to burn, and full often guiding life into a romance of sanctity. . . . There was something, therefore, in these five things which expressed the character of the Incarnate Word. They portrayed His human sanctity. They were a prophecy of the Three and Thirty years. They foreshadowed the spirit and genius of His Church in all ages. . . . Even now, what are all heresies which concern holy living but a dishonouring of them ? *Asceticism is part of the ignominy of the Cross*, and modern heathenism turns from it with the same disdain which the olden heathenism of Greece and Rome did in the days of the persecuting Cæsars." Even the Hindoo Theist will rise up in judgment against modern heresy.

erroneous principles which determined their first decline, this is not true of Theism in the abstract, which is a halfway house to Catholicity; the mere fact that a man is found to be a Theist tells us little until we know the quarter whence he came; he may have reached it on his upward journey towards truth as well as his downward descent towards error. This is precisely the crucial question with Indian Theism. Its limits are almost conterminous with European education, but it contains a miscellaneous crowd, who, though nearly allied in nominal belief, differ from each other *toto cœlo* in the religious principles which they make their rule of life. Many—we fear the great bulk—though they outwardly admit the existence of God, are, in fact, mere materialists, and act as if the present life were all they had to think of. Of them we have but little hope; but there are other Theists of a very different stamp—men who, having assented to the doctrine of Theism, make it the hinge on which all their opinions and principles turn, who say, if there is a God, every temporal interest is a mere trifle compared to the all-absorbing question what is His will, and how is it to be performed? Many, though not all of these earnest Theists, are adherents of the Brahmo Somaj, and after making every allowance for the gulf which exists—nowhere more so than in Anglicised India—between words and deeds, it is sad to witness the multitude of sincere and earnest men whose better instincts are starved and the purpose of their lives thwarted, because they have learned to accept it as a first principle, that that system which is the true goal of their aspirations must be condemned as a wicked absurdity and avoided like a pestilence.

Our aim, therefore, in the present article is to exhibit the moral forces in action among Hindoo Theists, to show from their writings that true principles are really at work, struggling, no doubt, with others which are fundamentally erroneous; and that among those who are now propagating these principles, all who are sincere ought to be led nearer and nearer to the Church, which should, through her missionaries, make herself more accessible to them, by taking a part in their inquiries and vindicating herself from the misconceptions with which she is now invested in their eyes.

The Brahmo Somaj began about 1830, and was at first more a protest against the excesses of Hindooism than an attempt to build up a new creed. The founder, Rajah Ram Mohun Raj, himself believed in no revelation, in the ordinary sense of that word, but found it advantageous to use the Vedas—the oldest and most venerated Hindoo Scriptures—as a lever to attack later errors. The rule of faith was the transparently inconsistent one that the Vedas were inspired *because* found conformable to natural reason, and therefore authoritative. A very few years, however, sufficed to show that what was considered by the Anglicised Hindoos of the

first half of the nineteenth century to be the teaching of natural reason, was by no means identical with the doctrines of the Vedas, and these were accordingly ere long rejected. But further difficulty soon presented itself. Scarcely one educated Hindoo in a hundred was prepared to accept the doctrines which the Theistic Church proposed as built on the universal rule of natural reason; reason was confronted with reason, and argument met by argument; to evade this dilemma, intuition was called in to supplement reason, and the same doctrines still proposed on this modified basis. The result, however, has been equally unsuccessful; not only the bulk of their countrymen refuse to accept their teaching, but even the Somaj itself has split up into two separate communions, and reason supplemented by intuition has become a house divided against itself.

Now, from the moment Brahmins adopted natural religion, that is the truths of reason and conscience, as their flag, they evidently held a position which Catholics regard as *in itself* consistent and true. As one of its advocates correctly argues from S. Paul—

“The wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness* of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness, because that which may be known of God is manifested in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse; because that when they knew God they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened.”† Now, from the expressions, “God hath shewed it unto them,” “clearly seen,” and especially “they are without excuse,” it is plain that the Apostle believed that the light of nature was quite sufficient to give man a correct knowledge of God.‡

This argument is used against certain Protestant opponents, who suicidally contended that the doctrine of the Deity could only be known from the Bible; it is perfectly sound as far as it goes, but the Brahmins fell into the fundamental error of forgetting or ignoring the principle that natural reason requires a virtuous disposition, or rather, as a Catholic would describe it, an active and sensitive correspondence with Divine Grace, to enable each individual both to *retain* a vivid realization of the fundamental truths of natural religion, and also to *infer correctly* from these as premisses the *further* truths which can be developed from them. On this account natural reason, though sufficient for the probation of

* The Brahmins, of course, use the Protestant version.

† Romans i. 18—21.

‡ A Defence of Brahmoism, &c., p. 8.

each individual, so as to render him "without excuse," is obviously ill-adapted to form the basis of a church which necessarily contains old and young, earnest and lukewarm, good and bad, and even among the good, persons of every varying stage of spiritual experience and sanctity, whose reason will therefore give forth relatively discordant answers when questioned. It follows that natural reason, though sufficient to give each individual man such an apprehension of Divine Truth as makes him responsible to a Judge, who knows his opportunities and will make allowance for errors which are not the fault of his own free will, totally fails when established as a court of appeal, and called upon to prescribe a code of truths which may form the basis of an organized religious community.

Again, the leaders of the Brahmists fell into the very error which was manifestly incidental to their claim. They acted as if infallible, and confidently proclaimed their own views as undoubted truths of natural religion. But though generally good and earnest men, they were far from perfect, and to a most laudable love of God and zeal for virtue they united a far from laudable bias against revelation in general, and a nineteenth century spirit of condemnation of all that was old and time-honoured. In accordance with the principle we have just stated, errors of the will generated errors of the intellect; and hence they maintained that natural reason condemned the practice of penance and asceticism, the incarnation of the Deity, objective (or as they call it) book-revelation, and other similar truths; the fact being that natural reason tells us nothing decisive about the incarnation of the Deity, approves, when fully vivified by the constant practice of virtue and meditation, of penance as a means of more intimate union with God, and instructs the mind, as we argue further on, to regard an objective revelation as at least highly probable and desirable.

Natural reason, then, though sufficient for man's probation as a rational creature, does not lead to religious unity; this the Brahmists have found out, and we may confidently urge it as a satisfactory sign of progress that they have begun to recognize the importance of virtue, not merely for its own sake, but also as *qualifying the intellect for religious truth*. The two lectures delivered in 1863 are nearly identical in tone; they both point out the inconsistency of their opponents in making the belief in God subsequent to, instead of independent of, revelation; and confidently take their stand on intuition as a full and adequate foundation for a universal natural religion. One of them, it is true, admits "the necessity of external influences, as occasions for calling forth the latent intuitions of the mind. . . . Education is necessary, not that it may put Theistic truths into the mind which were not there previously, but that it may develop the truths already existing there, and, with the aid of sound logic, constitute a complete and scientific system of natural

theology": * but though this train of thought, if followed up, would have proved fatal to the value of intuition *as a bond of religious unity*, the speaker manifests no apprehension of its dangerous tendencies, and lightly passes on to other subjects. In a few years, however, we find a most marked change *in tone*; the two lectures in 1866 were both by Keshub Chunder Sen † (whose position can best be understood by saying that he is to the Bengallee Brahmists what Father Faber was to the London Oratorians), and created a great sensation in Calcutta. Both manifest a most unsettled state of convictions; an intellectual uncertainty similar to the state of mind of the Tractarians when the bishops began openly to charge against them. Though no formal retractation is made, it is evident that the notion of intuition as supplying an innate bond of doctrinal union among mankind on religious subjects, has vanished. The first lecture is for a non-Christian so appreciative a eulogy of Jesus Christ, that the Protestant missionaries had reason to hope that it indicated a most important accession to their ranks. The second, on Great Men, was intended to damp these expectations by explaining, in a non-Christian sense, the *drift* of the previous lecture. As far as the lectures enable one to gather the speaker's mind, he endeavours to extricate the Brahmist theory from its difficulties by admitting revelations, but not *infallible* revelations. In fact, consciously or unconsciously, he appropriates the Protestant theory of the Church and applies it to the revelation itself. All great religious geniuses, he says, are inspired by God to propagate important religious truths; still they are not infallible in their teaching; they may err; and the individual mind must in the last resort, decide for itself what to accept and what to reject.

The language in which the leader of Hindoo Theism speaks of our Blessed Lord deserves to be extracted:—

Whatever differences there may be on strictly theological questions, I must say I am no hater of Christianity, much less of Jesus Christ. I cherish the profoundest reverence for the character of Jesus, and the lofty ideal of moral truth which he taught and lived. . . . There can be no question that Jesus was commissioned and destined by Providence for the great work which he came to perform. . . . He sacrificed Himself for the benefit of mankind. . . . It was from no selfish impulse, from no mistaken spirit of fanaticism, that he bravely and cheerfully offered himself to be crucified on the cross. He laid his life down that God might be glorified. I have always regarded the cross as a beautiful emblem of self-sacrifice unto the glory of God, one which is calculated to quicken the higher feelings and aspirations of the heart, and to purify the soul; and I believe there is not a heart, how

* The Brahmio Somaj Vindicated, p. 17.

† This gentleman is, we believe, on his way to England; in fact, he will probably be in England when this article appears.

callous and hard soever it may be, that can look with cold indifference on that grand and significant symbol. . . Verily he was above ordinary humanity. Sent by Providence to reform and regenerate mankind, he received from Providence wisdom and power for that great work. . . . Blessed Jesus, immortal child of God! For the world he lived and died. May the world appreciate him and follow his precepts. . . . The two fundamental doctrines of Gospel ethics, which stand out prominently above all others, and give it its peculiar grandeur, and its pre-eminent excellence, are, in my opinion, the doctrines of forgiveness and self-sacrifice; and it is in these we perceive the moral greatness of Christ. [And addressing his fellow-countrymen in his peroration, he says]:—And the better to stimulate you to a life of self-denial, I hold up to you the cross on which Jesus died. May his example so influence you, that you may be prepared to offer even your blood, if need be, for the regeneration of your country.*

These strong expressions naturally led to his being misunderstood, even by his own followers. In his next lecture he vindicated himself by the process of "levelling up." He indicated that his view of our Saviour was that He was *Primus*, but that He was only *Primus inter pares*. He says that God manifests Himself to man in a twofold manner—in nature and in history.

But in what manner does God manifest Himself in history? Through great men. . . . A great man is a giant among pigmies; he towers above the level of ordinary humanity. His greatness is unmistakable. It is through these great men, these leaders of mankind, that God reveals Himself to us in history; in short, they constitute what we mean by God in history. . . . That some nations have carried their reverence for prophets so far as to deify them, and worship them as God, or rather God in human shape, does not in the least appear to me surprising or unaccountable, however guilty they may be of man-worship. For if a prophet is not God, is he a mere man? That cannot be. Such an hypothesis would not adequately explain all the problems of his life. The fact is, as I have already said, he is both divine and human; he is both God and man. He is a "God-man." He is an incarnation of God. Yes, I look upon a prophet as a divine incarnation; in this sense that he is the spirit of God manifest in human flesh. True incarnation is *not as popular theology defines it, the absolute perfection of the divine nature embodied in mortal form*; it is not the God of the universe putting on a human body, the infinite becoming finite in space and time, in intelligence and power (!). It simply means God manifest in humanity, not God made man, but God *in* man. Man, however great he may be, *however excellent and divine his character, is human, and as such liable to all the imperfections and infirmities of man, and the thousand evils which flesh is heir to*. He is not generically different from the human kind, but is simply exalted above it in degree. Made of the same flesh and blood, endowed with the same constitution as ordinary men, he is far superior to them, on account of the high destiny of his

* Jesus Christ; Europe and Asia, pp. 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 25, 30.

life, the divine commission he bears, and the large measure of moral force which he naturally possesses for the successful accomplishment of the same. When, therefore, he is honoured above others as God's incarnation, we are to understand his superiority *to be one of degree, not of kind*. . . Great men appear when they are needed. . . . In the established economy of Providence they are special dispensations to meet the pressing wants of humanity.*

The attitude which the individual should assume towards the inspired Great Man is thus described :—

This makes every one of us feel a deep moral interest in them, and leads us to place ourselves in an attitude of reverent loyalty towards them, that we may receive from them the precious boon which they were designed and destined by God to confer on us. We cannot dishonour or trifle with them ; we cannot dispose of them, as mere great historic characters, with empty praise and admiration, we must regard them as God's manifestation to each one of us, and so open the whole heart to them, that it may be filled with all that is great, noble, and divine in them. We should so love and revere them that, under their influence and with their will, we may find Him whom they reveal.†

No test is suggested anywhere to enable a disciple to distinguish the chaff from the grain, to know what portions of a Great Man's teaching are stamped with his imperfections, and to be rejected as erroneous.

Like all other theories which endeavour to set up natural reason as the antagonist of revelation, this is absolutely suicidal. If there is one feature which stands out more prominently than another in the teaching of Christ of the Christian and Jewish prophets, it is that of *doctrinal exclusiveness*. If the Evangelists are to be trusted (apart from the question of their inspiration) as correct exponents of Christ's teaching, the Being whom the Brahmin leader considers the first of men—of whom he says, "It is my firm conviction that his teachings find a response in the universal consciousness of humanity,"‡—said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned."|| And the same idea is spread broadcast throughout Christ's teaching. If His followers can be supposed to be untrustworthy exponents of His views on this point, what guarantee have we that a single word, a single idea of His has been correctly handed down to us ? Now the virtue of doctrinal latitudinarianism is spoken of as a kind of first principle among Brahmins ; they speak of *Christian* exclusiveness in precisely the same manner as

* Great Men, pp. 6, 9, 11.

‡ Jesus Christ, &c., p. 24.

† *Ibid.*, p. 7.

|| S. Mark xvi. 15, 16.

Protestants do of *Catholic* exclusiveness. Was Christ wrong? If so, even according to their view the Greatest of Men was wrong on a point which obviously distorted the whole of His practical teaching, and has left its ill effects behind it for eighteen centuries: one too "who received wisdom and favour from Providence for that great work."* How much more, then, may the Brahmists themselves be wrong on any one of the doctrines which are the cornerstones of their system. As a fact, exclusiveness for what each one regards as true, is the natural offspring of love and earnestness for truth, as latitudinarianism is the natural product of lukewarmness and apathy. The Brahmists hold a smaller body of truth than Christians; hence they wish Christians to fraternize with them on religious questions; but they are exclusive, and properly exclusive, towards those who reject what they consider essential truth, and the more earnest of them have recently created a schism rather than keep up unity with the others who would not accept their doctrines. Plainly the question at issue is, what truths are essential and what not? and exclusiveness is as transparently a virtue for the former as it is a fault for the latter.

It occasions no surprise then to find that during the last three or four years Brahmism, as a coherent system of religion, built upon a specific rule of faith, has been in a state of dissolution. The Brahmists are slow to admit it; but the fact is patent to an outsider, and in none of the later publications which have fallen into our hands do we find any attempt to vindicate their original theory from the fatal objections which have been urged against it, though there is also no open admission of its failure. On the other hand, amid the unsettlement of mind thus caused, it is possible to trace a growing and sometimes striking appreciation of principles which are essentially Catholic, as we must endeavour now to show.

In order to facilitate our task, and make it more complete, it is necessary to state what we believe to be the ordinary as well as correct theory as to the manner in which faith is a *moral* probation, although it concerns questions mainly intellectual; this will enable us to bring out clearly the principles which should combine to lead a man whose mind is a *tabula rasa* in religion to faith in Catholicity. As a matter of fact, such persons have hitherto been few and far between, though everything seems to indicate that they will be more numerous in future; but all we say applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to those who believe in some erroneous religious system, and who thereby already hold a certain number of important truths, which they would otherwise have to acquire, and which, consistently followed up, tend to lead them out of their own religion and towards Catholicity; as, for instance, the dogmatic principle in the case of earnest Protestants. Catholicity, we need scarcely say, requires as

* Jesus Christ, &c., p. 5.

a fundamental truth that mankind, even without the aid of revelation, can arrive with certainty at the conviction that there is a God, a distinction between right and wrong, and that men are free and responsible agents. It is commonly, moreover, and (we are convinced) most truly held by Catholics that by faithfully acting up to these convictions, through God's help, each individual can constantly purify and illuminate his moral sense, diminish the disturbing influences of time, place, age, circumstances, and attain more and more nearly to the various truths of natural religion and morality. Now one of the most important of these virtues thus acquired is, if not Faith itself, that feeling of intellectual impotence and of absolute dependence upon God which is the chief precursor of Faith; and a person who, in this frame of mind, sincerely and prayerfully enters upon the examination of Catholicity and of its evidences is convinced of the truth of its claim, and Divine grace builds upon this human conviction the unswerving confidence of Faith. Such, in the outline, is the Catholic theory; but it is met at the outset by two grave objections: (1) that there are intelligent, sincere, and well-informed persons who do not accept the fundamental truths which we have alleged to be the common property of all men; (2) that there are unquestionably real, tangible, and plausible objections to Catholicity, which even the learned cannot adequately and efficiently remove, much more the unlearned multitude, who are called upon to believe in it. These two difficulties require an answer; and the general principles on which (we think) such answer can be given were set forth in an article which appeared in our number for last October under the title "Explicit and Implicit Thought." We will apply part of what was there said to the subject before us.

The first important distinction we have to insist upon is that between what is called in the article "reasoning," which is carried on implicitly and often unconsciously, and "arguing," which is explicit and, of course, conscious. Religious truth is obviously a question of reason and not argument; and as Dr. Newman says, in a passage quoted in that article, it is true of mankind, as a rule, that "they may argue badly but they reason well." Again, as experience no less than theory shows us, one most principal security for good implicit reasoning is "simplicity of intention." Now our contention is, that as a man's intellect awakens, *reason* leads him to the conviction that he is a creature, that there is a distinction between right and wrong, and that he is a responsible agent, and by consequence that he has a Creator, Legislator, and Judge. "Now it is self-evident that, among all who admit this fundamental body of truths, those alone act reasonably who build their whole course of life predominantly on its consideration, who ever seek moral and religious truth with earnestness and simplicity

of intention. In other words, a man acts more reasonably—whether he be educated or uneducated, speculative or unspeculative, matters not at all—the more constantly these primary religious doctrines occupy his mind as actively energizing premisses carrying him forward implicitly to a larger and larger assemblage of practical conclusions.”* Among these conclusions none is more important than the lesson which a thoughtful Theist soon learns, that there exists a great rival power to Theistic meditation, repose, and love—that great power which Christ calls “the world,” and which He declares to be in undying antagonism to His religion. This does not imply any feeling that there is an antagonism between duty towards God and duty towards our fellow-men, but that the spirit of the world tends towards selfishness, pleasure, material interests, individual success and reputation, conceit, pride, a constant sensitiveness in behalf of those truths which point to the dignity and importance of man, and the quasi-oblivion of the inevitable certainty of death at last, and its daily possibility; while the spirit of Theism invites to charity and forbearance towards others, self-denial, moral interests, the caring more for the success of the cause than for one’s own fame, self-diffidence, humility, a ready realization of those truths which show the littleness and dependence of man, and the habit of viewing things by anticipation in the light which the deathbed will shed upon them. Now mankind perceive this antagonism implicitly with unerring sagacity; and therefore the first and foremost virtue which we ought to look for in a Theist is that he should condemn the atmosphere of worldly interests and pleasures as adverse to moral and spiritual life. He need not be anxious to shun it: his duty in that respect depends on his mental constitution, and the bulk of mankind are designed for living and working in the world. But as mental or physical exercise, though it may even conduce to the health of a man, requires, in order that it should not sap his strength, that he adequately repair by food and rest the wear and tear that it occasions,—so an earnest Theist should feel that he must constantly have recourse to prayer, meditation, and other moral and spiritual food, to repair the injurious influences which necessary and proper attention to worldly affairs and duties would otherwise exercise.

Reserving for the present our reply to the second objection, the above considerations supply an easy answer to the first. That well-informed persons should sincerely (in the ordinary sense of the word) question the fundamental truths of religion, such as the existence and moral government of God, does not prove that their reason did not, in the first instance, operating implicitly, convince them of these truths, or that it would not, if faithfully and pro-

* DUBLIN REVIEW for October, 1869, p. 435.

perly exercised, have led them to accept further truth. In fact, there must be very few persons who will not admit that they once were firmly convinced of the existence and moral government of God, even if they have come to doubt them later on. The question is, when they held these truths, did they, acting reasonably, build their whole course of life predominantly on their consideration? did they allow creatures to fill the place which they saw to belong to their Creator, and so gradually to intercept and shut out the rays which proceeded from Him to illuminate their reason? For the purpose of invalidating the force of the objection urged (and this is all we are called upon to do), this seems to us conclusive; but though it may be difficult to prove, there are few who will not admit that the very persons who doubt fundamental Theistic truths are precisely those who, as far as man can judge, did not realize them or act up to them as they should, before their doubts commenced, and have therefore only themselves to thank for the haze which subsequently settled over their reason.

Now Brahminism has from the first been in accordance with Catholicity in the *capacity* for attaining truth which it has assigned to man's natural reason, but differed from it, as we have shown, (1) in ignoring the principle that virtue or correspondence with divine grace is necessary to the successful use of this reason; (2) in considering that natural reason condemns the *à priori* propriety and probability of revelation instead of most emphatically upholding it. It is therefore with the greatest gratification that we find that the truths which tend directly to establish these principles have of late years been rapidly growing on the religious consciousness of its adherents.

For instance, the antagonism between "the world" and true religion is recognized in the most emphatic manner by Keshub Chunder Sen in the preamble of his eloquent lecture on Great Men.

The age in which we live has its advantages as well as disadvantages. In these days of civilization and enlightenment, of industry and enterprise, of trade and manufacture, of steam and electricity, of scientific discoveries and inventions, there are on all sides cheering indications of material improvement and prosperity. But the age does not seem to be favourable to the spiritual interests of man. In the midst of all this pomp and splendour of material prosperity ill fares the spirit. While the senses enjoy an endless variety of physical comforts, *the soul droops and pines in an uncongenial atmosphere*. Modern civilization is eminently and *essentially materialistic*. . . . In the discharge of moral and religious duties especially, and in all concerns affecting the interests of the soul, men follow not the high and immutable principles of conscience, but the low and convenient standard of conventionalism. . . . From such tendencies which characterize the civilization of the present age, India is not entirely free. . . . The physical resources of the country are undergoing wonderful expansion and development, and

everywhere we behold daily multiplying signs of material prosperity. The intellectual gloom which for centuries covered its face is being dispelled by the rays of liberal education, and the mists of idolatry and superstition are fast disappearing. But alas ! what have we instead of these ?—*the materialism of modern civilization*. Utilitarian views have already spread far and wide among the educated classes, and Positivism counts its followers by hundreds. Few care about the sacred interests of the soul ; and those who do, rest contented with a few vague rationalistic dogmas. It is certainly the duty of all who are interested in the welfare of India to endeavour to check in due season these sceptical tendencies of the age, and to infix in the minds of the rising generation such positive ideas of the higher duties of religion, as may enable them to attain the blessings of salvation.

“ Modern civilization is essentially materialistic ” ! Pius IX., the Father of Christendom, has also warned us of this truth, for he has condemned the error that the Church of Christ ought to seek a reconciliation with modern civilization. No honest man can doubt his meaning. It is not the material improvements or discoveries of the age that he condemns ; not its railways, its telegraphs, its sciences, its instruments ;—they are all to be found in his dominions as elsewhere ;—it is its materialistic and utilitarian spirit, and the principles which emanate from that spirit, which are in deadly antagonism to the principles of the Kingdom of God. And for this he has been denounced from hundreds of pulpits, by hundreds of organs calling themselves Christian, while even the Hindoo Theist, nursed in the very atmosphere of the philosophy which he condemns, perceives the deep truth which is proclaimed so emphatically by the Successor of Peter.

Not only does the Brahminist leader admit thus categorically the antagonism between “ the world ” and religion, but he elsewhere dwells upon this truth more emphatically in his sermon on Regenerating Faith, deducing from it principles which, consistently followed out, lead directly to Catholicity.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the subject before us. . . . However obvious and simple the fundamental truths of speculative and practical Theism may be, and however supported they may be by common consent, a small amount of reflection will suffice to show that there are some very important points of disagreement amongst those who profess to believe in them. [A candid admission, which is obviously destructive of any attempt to build a universal church on the basis of common consent and natural reason.] The fact is—leaving aside the countless variety of sectarian creeds—even in regard to *Catholic** and *essential truths*, religion, as it prevails in the world, admits of a twofold classification. . . . The material distinction which exists

* The Brahminists always lay claim to the title Catholic ; an interesting fact, as showing that the mind spontaneously perceives that religion, to be true, must be in its character universal.

between these two systems of religion deserves our careful attention. . . . both spring up originally from the same root, but soon branch off in different and opposite directions. . . . I feel justified in calling the one the religion of the world, and the other the religion of heaven ; the one man-made, the other God-made religion. . . . In the religion of the world, man is his own guide, and to a great extent his own saviour. He depends upon his own faculties and powers for the attainment of truth and for deliverance from sin. *Its prayer is that man's will may be done on earth, in the name of God.* Whereas, the prayer of heaven's creed is that God's will may be done on earth as it is in heaven. In the one, religion is *subordinated to man's judgment* and wishes, and from the decrees of Providence there is always an appeal to human prudence [self-will ?] for final decision. In the other, God's will is absolute and immutable law, and His judgment final and irreversible.*

The preacher then continues to dilate on man's weakness and imperfection, adopting entirely the Christian view of human nature, and his remedy is as follows :—

There must be a clear turning-point in man's career. This turning-point is Faith. Once brought to this point, the heart of man undergoes a marvellous change . . . he gives up his old ideas and schemes of self-reformation, and believing that salvation cometh from God alone, he puts his humble faith in Him. Thus arrogance and self-sufficiency make room for humility and self-abnegation. . . . How humble is the man of Faith.

Nothing could sound better than this, and it is evidently a favourite view of Brahminism of the day, since the pamphlet on Deism and Theism, or Rationalism and Faith, written on the following anniversary, is drawn up in the form of a catechism, in which the religion of the world is called Deism, and the religion of God, Theism, or Faith.

Deism professes to believe God in the abstract, to love God in the abstract, and obey the abstract commandments of God. Theism professes to believe God in the way that He chooses to make His manifestation in the soul of man for his guidance and good. . . . Deism is of the world, and delights in the objects, pursuits, and advancement of the world, seeking only what is called the goodness of actions. Theism is of heaven, and has no part in the self-forgetful anxieties and avocations of the world.†

There is much in the above which looks directly towards Catholicity, but unfortunately in both pamphlets the explanation of Faith is incomplete and inadequate, though containing much that is excellent. Faith is represented as a constant living in the presence of God ; a "spiritual perception" of Him ; a moving "in a purer and holier atmosphere" ; and it "can effectually guard us against sin and temptation, and enable us to inhale purity as freely, as easily as

* Regenerating Faith, pp. 1—4. † Deism and Theism, p. 1.
VOL. XIV.—NO. XXVIII. [*New Series.*] 2 A

we now inhale impurity in the atmosphere of the world." So in regard to the immortality of the soul, we "must learn to realize the next world through Faith." From it comes Regeneration, which is "the death of the carnal nature, which we have in common with the lower animals, and the establishment in its place of a complete spiritual life in God."*

Were we engaged in controversy with Christians, it might be important to show how inadequate a conception this is of the doctrine of saving Faith as taught by Christ ; but we may be confident that a year or two will correct the excesses of the Brahmists in this respect : and as the realizing God's Presence as well as the other fundamental truths of Theism, and the distrusting ourselves, are important virtues, we may accept them as common ground, and endeavour to bring out the points which the Brahmist writers still treat defectively. They seem to confine their attention to remedying the errors of the will rather than the errors of the reason in fallen man, and the issue must be made a little clearer to analyze the question properly.

Retracing our steps, then, we find it admitted that important differences of opinion are found, "even in regard to Catholic and essential truths"; now the question is, does Faith remedy this evil, and bring with it a correct apprehension of Divine truth ; and if so, how ? Evidently a Brahmist must admit that it does, since if a doctrine be an essential error, the vivid spiritual perception and realization of this error as truth can only be fatal to virtue instead of fruitful of it. The question then arises, how ? Here too we are again in accord in the first step. A person who realizes the doctrine of an omnipotent and just Creator will feel bound to exercise his reason in *prayerful* dependence on his Maker, and to supplicate Him earnestly and confidently for guidance. But from this point two rival theories present themselves : (1) that God should *directly* assist the individual reason to decide correctly all the essential doctrinal questions which require belief ; (2) that the Almighty should embody His essential commands and teaching in an objective revelation, and should guide the individual reason to accept it as a religious authority. The latter is the Catholic principle ; low Churchmen and Dissenters generally adopt an inconsistent and confused intermixture of the two ; while the Brahmists appear to have adopted the former, without, however, in any way justifying their preference. Yet this point is, in fact, the crucial question in the whole field of religious inquiry ; and the principles which Brahmists have admitted ought to lead them unhesitatingly to look upon a revelation as being morally preferable, and *a priori* probable.

* Regenerating Faith, *passim*.

(1.) In the first place, if God's will is to assist each intellect to determine particular truths for itself, then each man is, in the last resort, his own authority, he is the voice of God to himself. His guarantee for any doctrine under discussion being true, is his own conviction that it is so; he may honestly believe that this conviction proceeds from God, but still his theory makes his own mind the inevitable channel of Divine inspiration, and therefore he can admit of no appeal from his own opinion to any other tribunal.

The consequence is, that a man must be self-confident and self-sufficient on religious questions. Now Brahmins teach that humility and self-distrust are true Theistic virtues, and should be the result of Faith. How can they be so, if the theory of personal guidance in regard to doctrine be true? In the lecture first named at the head of this article there is a special reference to this question:—

I desire to say a few words on the charge of arrogance and self-sufficiency, which has of late been frequently advanced against the Somaj. . . . Gentlemen, if the Brahmo Somaj inculcates one principle more than another on the minds of its followers, that principle is humility. Humility is one of the vital principles of the religion of the Brahmoes. . . . To say that Brahminism inculcates self-sufficiency is to say an untruth. That religion is not and cannot be a religion of self-sufficiency which acknowledges prayer to be indispensable to faith and salvation. . . . We admit as fully as anybody else the imperfections of man, his weakness and his liability to sin (also to error), and the impossibility of mere human agency to secure salvation.*

We quite admit that the Brahmins *preach* humility, but if truth is to be obtained without the aid of objective revelation where is there any *consistent field for the exercise* of that virtue in its most important branch, intellectual humility? As we said, prayer is the common property of all religions, certainly of none more than Catholicity; but if, after prayer, a man is to be justified in saying, in regard to a religious controversy, you are wrong because my judgment is against you, and I am divinely guided, how can he practise intellectual humility? No! Brahmins correctly recognize humility and self-distrust as fundamental virtues. "We must love God so thoroughly that our feelings, our *reason*, our faith, and our will may be entirely surrendered to Him, and be in unison with His holy nature";† and these virtues cannot be practised in their integrity unless God has somewhere revealed His Will and His teaching *objectively* and externally to each individual. Otherwise each man is the final judge in the case of his own doubts and difficulties, and has no other way of surrendering his reason to God than by submitting to himself!

* The Brahmo Somaj Vindicated, p. 11.

† The Future Church, p. 19.

To this all-important principle a very insidious objection is sometimes urged ; it is said that to accept revelation as true, and an authority as divinely commissioned, is in itself an act of private judgment, and if we must rely on ourselves for this, we display no more self-sufficiency in constituting ourselves judges in detail. This is constantly objected to Catholics by Protestants, and may be equally objected to revelation in general ; but by comparing the analogous operations of the intellect and the will it is found to be entirely fallacious. To be self-willed is regarded as a very intelligible fault, and to be unselfish a virtue ; yet the whole merit of doing an act pleasing to another is that it be voluntary. An act which is involuntary is in no way meritorious ; but if a man, by the exercise of his own will, brings himself to carry out the wishes of others, he is rightly considered to deserve the greatest credit. Hence it is plain that a man is properly regarded as unselfish when he wills, *in the general*, to sacrifice his own will *in particulars* to the will of others. The very same may be said of the intellect. Man, being an intelligent creature, an act of faith must be an act of his intelligence ; but the merit of intellectual humility and of submission to the Divine reason lies not in abdicating the use of reason, but in so using it *in the general* as to be ready to waive the right of following it *in particulars* : an act which is impossible if the individual judgment be the channel of Divine teaching in particulars, but possible if there be anywhere a revelation external to the individual.

Hence, in proportion as a man realizes, as the Brahmins do, the important truth that intellectual humility, diffidence, and self-distrust are virtues proper to intelligent creatures in respect to their Creator, so ought he to be drawn on to conclude that it is fitting and probable that the Divine teaching should be embodied in an authority external to himself and entitled to claim his belief.

(2.) A second reason why an objective revelation is probable is to be found in the fact that though *fundamental* truths are attainable by the natural reason, man has an instinctive craving for a deeper and clearer insight into the mysteries of religion than he can thus obtain. The primary truths of Theism serve but to stimulate a devout man to seek to know more of the mysteries of Divine love, salvation, and redemption. Now, if God's guidance is limited to assisting each prayerful and virtuous man to decide correctly the questions which come within the cognizance of natural reason, it is plain that deeper truths must remain for ever a sealed book, and this want be unsatisfied ; whereas an objective revelation, besides fixing on an immovable rock the truths of natural religion, and rescuing those who believe in it from the dangers of error, also affords a channel for such supernatural truths beyond the range of human reason as the Divine wisdom may see fit to communicate

to man. We are convinced that this argument has far greater implicit weight than may seem to attach to it when stated explicitly. God, who designed to reveal Himself to man, has implanted in the human mind an instinctive craving for a revelation, and a kind of dissatisfaction with the limits of natural religion, which are specially designed to induce him to persevere in a state of inquiry, till he finds rest in submission to the truth.

(3.) There is a third most important distinction between the two theories, which reason intuitively perceives in its full force, though we find it difficult to express it with equal cogency. All mathematicians know that at certain angles some of the functions of those angles cannot be employed in calculation without increasing a hundredfold the risk of mistake. For instance, to use the tangent of an angle measured to be nearly 90° , or the cotangent of an angle of a few seconds only, is to court error. In a similar manner, the theory of individual inspiration evokes the maximum of human error and frailty, while that of an external inspiration, and of Divine guidance to accept the inspired authority, reduces it to a minimum. We may assume it as admitted that prayer, earnestness, a vivid realization of the Divine Presence and of other fundamental verities, and a virtuous life, are requisites to a correct appreciation of doctrinal truth; now if the problem to be solved with the Divine guidance, is whether such and such an alleged revelation is true or not, each man can and should once for all concentrate all his prayers, all his inquiries, all his intellectual energies, all his earnestness, in deciding the question, and, once decided, he has but to become as a little child, and accept the teaching of his Heavenly Father. But if there is no objective revelation, if the natural reason of the individual has to determine each doctrinal truth, each moral question as it arises, the liability to error is at a maximum. The will acts powerfully upon the intellect and disturbs its correctness, and the reason will consequently be placed at the extreme of disadvantage for aiming at an unbiassed and true conclusion at each critical moment, when its pronouncement ought to be most clear and decisive. For the more a man is tempted by interest or inclination to deviate from the right path, the more he needs that his conscience be clearly guided by his intellect to condemn it. If his rule of faith is external to himself, this will be so, the teaching he accepts will be as sharply, as pointedly adverse to his wishes as ever; not so, however, if he is his own final arbiter. The very judgment which his intellect clearly endorsed before, when not under temptation, will now appear doubtful and uncertain, for the very reason that the intellect is urged by the will to question it. As an instance, Theists as well as Catholics may be monogamists. The Catholic accepts this doctrine on the authority of the Church, and if ever tempted to marry a second wife, could not alter the pre-

ciseness of the condemnation which his wishes receive from it. Not so, however, a Theist. His previous opinion is always open to reconsideration, by the same authority that promulgated it, *viz.*, himself; and the chances are that, in the hour of temptation, the will to marry a second wife would bias the intellect, which previously condemned the practice, into now approving of it. It was thus that Luther and the leaders of the so-called Reformation gave their sanction to bigamy in a well-known instance; and Henry VIII. found any pretext sufficient for a divorce, when he had once rejected the authority which curbed his licentiousness.

We might multiply arguments in favour of the *à priori* propriety of a revelation; but the above considerations, derived as they are from fundamental verities implanted in every human heart, seem abundantly to establish the principle we are contending for; in fact, we can trace a dawning conviction of this kind among the Brahmists themselves, since in the arbitrary distinction drawn between Deism and Theism, the former is condemned, among other errors, for being "independent of any revelation that is made of God's nature from time to time by such holy men or prophets or his chosen children as He honours with special inspiration for that purpose over and above other human beings." Whereas Theism "yields itself to the counsels of higher experience, the gentle precepts of sainted human brotherhood, left to earth as a holy legacy of heaven."*

But this reasoning does not stop short at the abstract probability of a revelation; all the arguments which we have just urged in proof of its *à priori* probability and propriety apply with equal force in favour of God having instituted a system such as Catholicity as the pillar and ground of truth, the custodian and judge of His revelation. For the one fundamental principle which recommends the theory of an objective revelation, is the provision which it affords for a standard of truth and right, external to the individual mind, to which it can with humility, self-distrust, and childlike confidence conform itself; but this requires as a *sine quâ non* that the revelation be definite and decisive in regard to all the essential doctrines which it teaches. If it fails to do so; if its pronouncements are faltering and uncertain; if learned, or even ordinarily sensible and well-informed men, adopt different and inconsistent interpretations; it ceases to be an authority, and the individual, however much he may wish to be humble, childlike, and self-distrustful, is compelled to arrogate to himself the task of sitting in judgment on the conflicting opinions of others probably wiser and better than himself, and placing his confidence in the correctness of his own decision! Now it is not too much to say that no religion in the world affords an authority of this kind except

* Deism and Theism, pp. 2, 4.

the Catholic Church. In fact, it is almost self-evident that this must be the case ; since no other supplies in any adequate manner an organized tribunal as the judge of controversy, the divinely appointed arbiter of doctrinal disputes. However carefully worded and systematically drawn up written documents may be, the experience of wills and deeds of contract shows abundantly that it is impossible to avoid some uncertainty and dispute in regard to their contents. How much more so then, when the doctrinal teaching is contained in fragmentary and transparently incomplete records, such as the Christian Scriptures. The same argument might be applied to Hinduism or Mahommedanism, but it is needless ; for however much of good Brahmists, and we also, may find in some of the features of those religions, they well know that if any revelation is true, it is Christianity. Again, the religious instincts of man draw him on to crave for religious unity ; we perceive this want in every outline of Brahmism, in every attempt at organizing a Church that has been made in India. But such unity is only possible in one system—a system of a perpetually abiding authority, divinely commissioned to decide the ceaseless controversies which will inevitably be perpetually springing up. The only system which furnishes such an authority, is that which is built on the rock of Peter.

Thus, step by step, we arrive at the goal of our argument : viz., that an earnest, humble, and prayerful Theist ought to be led on to view the claim of the Catholic Church as reasonable and antecedently probable, nay, even ought to be imbued with a hopeful anxiety to find it true, in order that he may have a field for the exercise of those virtues which he has learned to regard as the supreme duty of an intelligent creature towards his Creator. A moral and earnest inquirer *ought* to be led on to be prepossessed in her favour, certainly to examine the evidences she adduces without the least shade of hostile bias or antipathy.

We must not, however, conclude without anticipating an objection which many may be inclined to urge. It will be objected, that we have only dealt with the outworks of the question at issue ; that it may be conceded that the claim of the Church, viewed in the abstract, is reasonable and proper enough ; but that inquiry and the examination of evidence are so fatal to that claim that any antecedent probability entirely disappears before the subsequent violent improbability which investigation discloses. No doubt this may be said ; but we are confident that a more groundless and untrue objection it is impossible to make : we admit at once that many persons who study controversy conclude against the Church, and condemn her in no measured terms ; but we say that this is entirely due to the hostile bias, instead of the favourable or at least impartial spirit in which the question should be approached.

One unquestionable fact is alone sufficient to show this : viz.

that ordinary anti-Catholic controversy is shamelessly mendacious and unfair. There are specious and even weighty objections which can be learnedly and plausibly put forward: but as Dr. Newman has shown in one of his inimitable lectures on the position of Catholics in England, these rarely if ever take root in the public mind, and find but scant favour; while the grossest misrepresentations, again and again exposed, flourish and spread with undiminished vitality.

For instance, the Brahmists, no doubt, have deluded themselves into the belief that they have done full justice to Catholicity; they look upon it as transparently false and corrupt, and never allude to it except in terms of unmeasured condemnation. Yet they have drawn all their notions of it from its bitterest and most unscrupulous enemies; and they know full well that they have never attempted to look at it from its own point of view, to let it speak for itself, or to read Catholic books of controversy or explanation. Most of the allusions to the Catholic Church to be found in their writings display an ignorance and a prejudice which are painfully astounding. If there is one Brahmist who towers above all for ability, for candour, for earnestness, it is Keshub Chunder Sen: if he is startlingly ignorant and prejudiced on the subject of Catholicity, what must the others be? And his qualifications for forming an impartial and correct judgment on this all-important subject may be gathered from what he says in his otherwise remarkable lecture on Jesus Christ, Europe, and Asia.

To begin with, it does not look like impartiality or an unprejudiced attitude of mind to speak of "the debasing system of Popery"; to call it "a system of superstition, priestcraft, and immorality, which it is awful to contemplate"; to say that "the sale of indulgences was the culminating point of this wicked system of Popery, and drew the mighty Luther on the stage." These are strange opinions in the mouth of one who professes to love God above all things, to realize His awful presence, to preach and practise prayer, humility, and submission of the reason to Divine truth, to condemn the spirit of the world as essentially sceptical and materialistic, and who thereby shows that, if he only knew it, if only the veil were withdrawn from his eyes, if only he were consistent, he has accepted the essential principles which are the legitimate foundation of that very system which he calls so debasing! But we know too well the sources from which these opinions spring; we are therefore content to stigmatize them as transparently prejudiced opinions, and thus to leave them. Not so, however, when we abandon the debatable ground of opinions and come to glaring errors of fact and history.

Since the Reformation almost new life was infused into Christianity, and several circumstances conspired to facilitate its dissemination. Its more ardent followers, inflamed with holy zeal, have gone about in all directions to

preach the religion of the Cross to their benighted brothers and sisters in remote countries. . . . There are now three hundred millions of Christians in the world, or three-tenths of its entire population. . . . Let us come nearer home, and see what has been done in our country. So far back as 1706, a few Danish missionaries came out to India to establish a mission. The scene of their labours was Tranquebar, in South India. In 1786, one Mr. John Thomas came out to Bengal as a surgeon, and, after making some desultory attempts to preach Christianity among the natives, returned home. . . . Christian missionaries have since gradually multiplied, and Christian churches have been founded in all parts of the country. The total number of native converts to Christianity has been estimated at 154,000.*

Now we know that the lecturer did not intend to deny the title of Christians to Catholics, for the figures he gives for the number of Christians in the whole world show that he includes them: yet when he speaks of India he seems never to have heard of the fact that Catholic missions have been at work there constantly from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century; that in spite of the most cruel disadvantages missionaries of the Church have made and even retained about 1,000,000 converts; that they have anticipated, not followed, the triumph of British arms; and even to this very day, in parts of India, endure hardships to which their Protestant brethren, without robbing them of one iota of the praise which is their due, are, it may be safely said, utter strangers. All this he knows not, or—worse—heeds not. He passes over the apostolate of a Xavier, and the ever memorable mission of Madura, in order to rescue from oblivion Tranquebar and Mr. John Thomas!

Again, what can we say to the amazing assertion that missionary enterprise owes its vitality to the Reformation! God, it is true, reformed His Church through the Council of Trent, soon after Luther and his followers rebelled against it. In all quarters saintly men were the fruit of a renewed outpouring of Divine grace. S. Ignatius of Loyola, S. Charles Borromeo, S. Francis of Sales, S. Theresa, S. John of the Cross, S. Philip Neri, appeared almost simultaneously; and Catholic missionaries, with renewed vigour, repaired the losses of the kingdom of God by fresh victories in America, in India, in China, and in Japan; at the same time too in England Elizabeth, by her gallows and her quartering-block, was assiduously reinforcing that noble army of martyrs in Heaven whose blood and intercession are daily winning us back in crowds to the Church our forefathers abandoned, and pleading for that return of England to the Faith, so earnestly longed for in the heart of hearts of the Church militant on earth and triumphant in Heaven. In this sense it

* *Jesus Christ*, pp. 10 and 11.

may be said no doubt that the Reformation infused new life into Christianity ; but in the communions that broke off from unity is it open to denial that its fruit was an almost entire abstention from missionary enterprise for nearly 200 years ? Human pride and the self-sufficiency of private judgment quenched the divine flame of love which finds a natural vent in that ardent devotion for the souls of others, which burns in the breast of the true missionary, and chilled the desire for self-sacrifice and self-abnegation which the true Faith inspires ; and with the exception of a few isolated efforts of the Moravians, Protestant missions were not. At last, some ninety years ago, under the influence of Divine grace, the tide began visibly to return. The great bulk of the stream of Protestantism still, as heretofore, flows down towards the ocean of infidelity and utter negation ; but on the flanks of it a backward eddy has set in towards the truth of God and the Church of God. It began with the evangelical revival of a strong and ardent personal love of God and our Saviour Christ ; and this love developed itself into a revived appreciation of true Christian doctrine on the one hand, and true Christian practice on the other. The former has led towards Catholicity step by step, till it has resulted in hundreds of conversions of the flower of the Anglican Church to the Church of Christ during the last thirty years ; the latter, combined with other causes, has led to the wonderful missionary activity displayed during the same period. Both are in antagonism to the spirit of the Reformation, as they are diametrically opposite to its immediate and direct fruits. We have only to look at the name of Wilberforce to see that Anglicanism is the legitimate child, as Catholicity is the grandchild, of original Evangelicalism. The bulk of minds are no doubt slow to move, tardy in finding out the true tendency of their principles, often also reluctant in carrying them out to their consistent results, when they do become apparent. Hence we can account for the anti-Catholic prejudices which still linger among the adherents of a school which properly leads to Catholicity. But the history of the leading minds of one generation is that of the rank-and-file of the next : the great leaders of the Catholic movement of our day, almost to a man, were so-called Evangelicals at first ; while such eminent minds as have refused to submit to the Church have, with few exceptions, fallen back into latitudinarianism, or worse. So far as it is not due to emigration and conquest or to the spread of education, missionary energy is the practical, as High Anglicanism is the doctrinal effect of the Catholic reaction among Protestants.

With such views of history it is idle to pretend that Brahmists have fairly or adequately examined the claims of the Church, or that their condemnation of her can be regarded as reasonable ; nor is the case improved by the manner in which they deal with her

doctrine. This is important, since not only is the *general* claim of the Church to divinely commissioned authority, a claim entirely unique of its kind, a direct appeal to the moral sense of all who know of it, but her moral doctrines also co-operate in affording a moral probation; as the Brahmist lecturer truly said, "they find a response in the universal consciousness of humanity." It does not follow that each individual ought to expect to find them absolutely in accord with his own opinions *in every particular*; for though in a model man, perfectly corresponding with Divine Grace, the intellect *can* step by step attain to a knowledge of all moral truths; yet, in fact, each individual mind is so deranged in its orbit by prejudices of country, circumstances, or constitution, as well as by imperfect correspondence with Divine Grace, that the most it can ever hope to arrive at, without the guidance of the Church, is a generally correct code of morality; therefore in some particulars its own erroneous opinions will make the corresponding true teaching of the Church appear erroneous. But in broad outline the teaching of the Church is in unison with the moral instincts of every man, and hence can appeal to them for a general support; on this account a fair and candid appreciation of doctrines is a great aid to conviction, and a systematic misrepresentation of them a notable mark of *a priori* bias and hostility. We look in vain however for such appreciation from the Brahmists. We can take no better instance than the principle of asceticism, which they at first openly condemned as contrary to the teachings of man's moral consciousness. Time however has modified their views; as they have advanced in spiritual experience, so have they come nearer and nearer to this doctrine, till we find one of them thus writing in 1868:—"The soul is not only to be dead to the world, but alive unto God and truth; it must not only retire from the world, but enter into the kingdom of heaven. . . . In the natural course of man's progress it is invariably the case that as the body dies, the spirit rises regenerated; that in proportion to the mortification of the carnal is the development of the spiritual life; and that the further the soul is from the world the nearer it is to the kingdom of God. In fact, carnal death and spiritual life go together, and are inseparable in the normal development of the soul."* Can the principle at the root of asceticism be more correctly described? The fault, if any, is that the lecturer errs by excess of devotion to the doctrine; he seems to impose asceticism of the most complete kind as a *sine quâ non* to salvation; whereas, the Church, with higher wisdom, knowing that "all men cannot receive the saying, only they to whom it is given,"† holds it out as attainable in its integrity by few only, though

* Regenerating Faith, p. 22.

† S. Matthew, xix. 11.

it should be aimed at in a lesser degree by all in their several callings. Our readers may well be astonished then, when we now insert the words we omitted from the quotation. "To stop short at the negative work, as some unfortunately do, is asceticism, mere self-mortification. This is unnatural, and cannot be the end of human existence." Can anything be more unfair? Catholic ascetics, and, we believe, all others also, ever regard the development of the spiritual life as the object of the mortifications of the flesh which they practise, the very be-all and end-all of their asceticism. Now that the Brahmists have found out the error of their former opinions, have learned that asceticism is a true principle too hastily condemned by them, it will be greatly to their honour if they preach it as openly and candidly as they once denounced it. But to be ashamed of their conversion to a Catholic doctrine, and to endeavour to conceal the fact by docking that doctrine of its essential object, this is surely not the predisposition to faith which Divine Grace is likely to bless.

We have naturally selected the Brahmists as our illustration; but what is true of them is true unfortunately of almost all; and, as a matter of fact, it is rare to find persons who exhibit an impartial spirit (still less an anxious hope to find the Church right) in their inquiries into the claims of the Catholic Church. When however this spirit is exhibited, it rarely fails to lead to conversion; we have heard even Protestants remark, when any one of their number manifests the least earnestness and fairness in examining Catholicity, that he is sure to end in submitting to it; and we have known many instances in which their prognostications have come true. The experience no doubt of any individual is not worth much, but it is easy to show that it is forcibly corroborated by theory. The controversy about Catholicity will be found (as one of our Brahmist friends said about Theistic religion) to "admit of a twofold classification; and each system presents peculiar features which clearly distinguish it from the other." Thus we do not find Catholics and Protestants choosing the same fields of controversy, and alternately obtaining triumphs according to their respective talents. On the contrary, there is a marked contrast in the fundamental tone of the arguments which are respectively preferred, and it is not too much to say that positive and constructive arguments, general principles, broad lines of thought, are all in favour of the Church, and are never validly answered by her opponents: on the other hand, negative and destructive arguments, and objections in points of detail, form the staple weapons of all anti-Catholics. What more complete specimen of this could be found than in one of the latest works which has obtained the general applause of the anti-Catholic world—Janus? Janus professes to believe the Catholic Church to be the oracle of God; but he attacks that constitution of the Church

which is generally accepted as its foundation. Does he suggest any other to replace it? does he contrast what he attacks with any rival theory which he would substitute for it, and weigh the evidence for one against the other? No! he takes refuge in the easy and safe paths of negative criticism; and thus conceals the nakedness of his cause, which any positive counter theory would expose.

Any one conversant with controversy can testify that this is but a single instance of a general truth; it will be found that the persons who remain dissatisfied with the evidence in favour of the Church are those who conduct their inquiries with a bias against her which we have shown to be immoral, because it is a disloyalty to moral principles which it is within their power to attain to; and this bias is shown more than anything else by their adopting the method of negative criticism and detailed objections, generally also of reading anything written by her opponents and nothing by her adherents.

Such a method of inquiry is radically and essentially wrong; it evinces a determination to find fault, and shuts up the avenues to conviction. The reason of this is by no means that these objections are unanswerable; on the contrary, considering the defective character of the materials on which they are often based, and the mere mathematical probability that in some few out of countless instances the weight of evidence will be found on the wrong side (such accidental convergence of evidence as has ere this condemned many an innocent man), we think that Catholic apologists have, on the whole, performed their task of replying to objections successfully and even triumphantly. We also admit that allegiance to the cause of truth requires that some of the most able Catholic writers should still continue to reply to the most plausible and specious objections which are from time to time put forward. But it remains that this method of inquiry is wrong and indefensible; that persons who fly to objections have not the right disposition for faith, and

Uno avulso non deficit alter.

The number of them is interminable, and each, however well answered, leaves some trace of distrust behind it.

On the contrary, an honest and humble man sees intuitively, as it were, that to abandon the field of general principles and broad lines of argument in favour of objections in points of detail, which require for their decision a considerable amount of research and ability, is to shut the door to the natural road to truth, and invite the probability of error. He perceives that if there is any such thing as truth, it must be attained from the consideration of large and fundamental principles, or it is not attainable at all; starting

from this as his basis, he sees that the human mind wants a revelation, it wants a revelation guaranteed by an adequate authority : these it finds in Catholicity only. It craves for unity and universality in religion. Not only as a fact does it find these in Catholicity alone, but it finds there the only organization which can even furnish a possibility of their existence. The society, claiming this authority, traces its foundation and its commission to Jesus Christ, and inquiry shows that Jesus Christ was, to say the least, the most remarkable man that ever lived, and that He did plainly announce His intention of founding a society on earth, to endure for ever, and that the present Catholic Church is the only society that in any way corresponds with it. He sees that it is built on a rock, that its keys are in the hands of Peter, that he does feed its sheep and confirm his brethren ; that this Church still dares to say, "it seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us," and still lays down the test of truth and error proclaimed by S. John, after every other Apostle had gone to his rest : "He that knoweth God heareth us, and he that is not of God heareth us not ; hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." That it alone has a constitution which makes heresy and schism real sins instead of unmeaning sounds.

Again, when he turns to the history of the Church it palpably corresponds, at least in its broad outlines, with what its claim leads us to expect. It stands in the foreground in the faint records of primitive Christianity ; it survives trials and dangers fatal to any ordinary society ; it still thrives, in spite of the persecutions of the Roman empire, the inroads of the barbarians, the moral corruption of the Middle Ages, the great schism of the fifteenth century, the general dissolution of faith inaugurated in the sixteenth ; and now, in our own age, it protests unfalteringly against its "essentially materialistic spirit," and ceaselessly fights against that "uncongenial atmosphere," in which "the soul droops and pines."

Having once taken this view of the case, it is not too much to say that it is as much as a man's Theism is worth for him to refuse allegiance to a society with such broad evidences in its favour, merely because destructive criticism can be speciously applied to its history, or objections urged in matters of complicated detail. Can the bulk of mankind do justice to the arguments alleged on both sides in the case of Honorius ? Can they be expected to decide whether the Primacy conceded to the See of Peter in the first and second centuries was merely one of honour, or of jurisdiction also ? Can they be expected to weigh the evidence as to the date of the prophecies of Daniel, or to pronounce on the authenticity of the Pentateuch ? Can it be believed that a good and merciful God should plant in the human breast a craving for an

authority such as that of the Catholic Church ; that He should allow a society to exist supplying this moral want, with such general evidences in its favour ; that He should allow His creatures to be reasonably misled and duped into submitting to this society (and duped the more readily the more humble and self-distrustful they are), unless, with the most inexcusable self-sufficiency, they devote themselves to the scrutiny of intricate objections, and reject the Church on their own view of difficult questions, which they do not fear to decide, though doctors disagree ? Can a man consistently continue to believe in God's moral government, and believe this ? Nor does the counter argument so frequently urged hold good. How can God allow such objections to be possible against a society which He wishes men to submit to ? For God wills that submission to the Church be a moral probation. Why, then, should He not permit the existence of objections sufficiently specious to detain in their unbelief those who approach the question in a wrong and culpable spirit ? It is evident that the whole question turns on what mental attitude is right and moral in presence of the claim of the Church ; if a hostile bias is sinful, and if humility and other virtues should predispose the mind to view this claim hopefully and favourably ; if, moreover, the candour thus produced will lead naturally to the application of the test of broad and obvious principles, rather than of intricate and involved questions of detail, then the value of the argument derived from the Divine permission of these objections disappears ; it is resolved into this, that God permits those who inquire in a sinful spirit to arrive at a wrong conclusion.

And this is, in fact, our answer to the second of the two objections referred to in an earlier portion of this article, and there left unanswered. It is incidental to the very nature of the Catholic claim that it should be open to plausible and difficult objections. Every large theory, however true, is similarly exposed to attack, and critical ingenuity can easily propose difficulties, which can be answered, if at all, at best in a tentative and uncertain manner. For long it was impossible to reconcile the absence of parallax in the case of the fixed stars with the enormous diameter which the Copernican system rightly ascribed to the earth's orbit ; and we write under correction, but we believe that even now some of the difficulties connected with comets and their tails seem almost insoluble on the received principles of gravitation.

In the same manner the doctrines of the inspiration of Scripture and the infallibility of the Church involve a special affirmation with regard to thousands of propositions of history and other sciences which may be evolved from the pages of Scripture and the decisions of the Church. Is it a matter of surprise that anti-Catholic ingenuity has succeeded in raking together a goodly stock

of specious and plausible objections, and is it unreasonable from the analogy of other sciences to be satisfied with but indifferent explanations of some of them, when the intellect is supported in its conviction by large and comprehensive arguments, similar to those which have, from the outset, led it on from one affirmation of truth to another? Above all, are we not told that to enter the kingdom of heaven we must become as little children; and is it more like a little child to have recourse to minute and intricate criticism, or to follow the instinctive principles which are provided by Providence for the guidance of all?

We maintain, then, that an earnest and humble Theist ought to be favourably inclined to accept the claim of the Catholic Church, and that the evidence in her favour is precisely such as will convince a mind thus predisposed. The human conviction thus acquired is converted by God's grace, on submission to the Church, into the unswerving certainty of Divine Faith.

In conclusion, we perhaps ought to add a few practical suggestions as to the means which should be adopted to interest Brahmists and other Indian Theists in the Catholic Church, remove the prejudices which now beset their minds, and prepare the way for their conversion. The first and greatest need is that some of the Catholic Missionaries, best qualified by natural acquirements and leisure for the task, should interest themselves in the Brahmists' speculations, and lose no opportunity of taking part in them. They should watch the fluctuations of the controversy, the constant struggle going on between Divine Grace and human pride, make the points of contact with, and separation from, Catholicity as clear as possible, and be ever ready to remove misconceptions. Again, the gross fallacies which now prevail, such as that Luther and Knox were saints and heroes, men of the highest principle and morality; that Primitive Christianity was anti-Roman Catholic, and like modern Presbyterianism; that after the Reformation, virtue and sanctity, and the love of God were to be found rather in the communions reformed by Luther and Calvin, than in that reformed by the Council of Trent,—should be exposed from time to time in lectures specially designed for educated natives, which it would not be difficult to induce them to attend.

No one, we think, can read the extracts we have given from the later writings of the Brahmists, without admitting that they exhibit a very marked attraction to many true principles of morality, of which the Catholic Church is the only consistent and legitimate home. The issues of this movement are in the hands of Providence, of Divine Grace. But then the correspondence of human free will is also necessary; and let it not be said that Catholics fail in their share of this work by their supineness or indifference.

ART. III.—FRA PAOLO SARPI.

The Life of Fra Paolo Sarpi. By ARABELLA GEORGINA CAMPBELL. From Original MSS. London : Molini & Green. 1869.

FRA PAOLO SARPI, the Venetian Servite, though not one of the foremost figures of European history, has an interest of his own. His life is one of the many episodes connected with the Reformation in Europe. It was not his fault that he was not the Luther of Venice. As the author of a garbled history of the Council of Trent, his importance is in proportion to the damage he has done; and as the victim of an ugly assassination, he frequently receives the credit of being a martyr to the vengeance of Rome from those who detest Rome as much as he himself did.

Several lives of this hero are known to literature. Courayer has prefixed one to his translation of the "Concilio di Trento." De Thou gives a memoir of him; Grisellini another.* But all these are founded, to a greater or less degree, upon that which is attributed to Fra Fulgenzio Micanzio, a religious of his own order, and a devoted disciple of his own. This life is prefixed to the Helmstadt edition of the works of Fra Paolo (1750). It has been doubted whether this life is really by Fra Fulgenzio; but the discovery of the MS. at Venice in 1849 has set the matter at rest. The latest homage to his memory in the shape of a biography has been executed by a lady.† Miss Arabella Georgina Campbell has examined, "under special favour," the autograph "Vita di Fra Paolo Sarpi," by Fra Fulgenzio Micanzio, in the archives of Venice, and "was at the same time graciously permitted to peruse the whole collection of Fra Paolo's MSS., of which there are twenty-nine volumes folio." The result of her labours is a curiosity in biography. The style is so bad, the sentences so tumbled together, the narrative so confused and spasmodic, that to read much of it is demoralizing to the taste. The writer's translations of Italian documents show an ignorance so astounding in the instances where the original can be consulted, that the apparent nonsense of many of the others is easily accounted for. Here is one example. The following words

* Il Genio di Fra Paolo Sarpi.

† See the work named at the head of this article.

occur in a letter of the Nuncio at Venice to Cardinal Borghese (October 6th, 1607), "Li Sig. del Consiglio di X. che formano il processo, per quanto si dice in pubblica, hanno inditti delle persone, le quali si crede, che habino commesso il delitto." The translation is this:—"The Council of Ten have passed a law by which they say publicly that they have indicted some persons whom they believe to have committed the offence." Of course we have not been able to compare the translation of inedited MSS. with their originals, but unless those originals are frequently devoid of all sense, there is reason to conclude that they are frequently mistranslated. As a contribution to history the book has no worth beyond the new materials with which it furnishes us. It is full of inaccuracies, which might have been prevented by the use of sources long since printed and published; it contains numerous ridiculous "facts" and sentiments about the Catholic Church; and its only satisfactory feature is the complacency of the authoress whenever she discovers a fresh proof that Fra Paolo was a Protestant. The new matter consists chiefly of extracts from the correspondence of Contarini, the Venetian ambassador at Rome at the time of Fra Paolo's attempted assassination. Of the value of these we shall speak further on.*

To form a correct idea of the keen and intellectual man, whose prim appearance and slightly scornful face are not unfamiliar in engravings, both his age and his country have to be considered. In the year 1605, when Paul V. ascended the papal throne, Europe was almost calm after much storm. The head of the Church could look round upon Christendom, and think that once more the nations of Europe had begun to acquiesce in his sway as Vicar of Christ. England, it was true, was outside the pale. But the vigorous queen, whose wounded pride had so long supported in every part of Europe the enemies of the Church, had passed away; and for two years the English throne had been held by a king, of whom it was known that he had personal leanings to the faith of his mother. In all probability it was already known at Rome, as it was certainly known a few years afterwards, that James was ready to acknowledge the Pope as the first and chief of bishops, but that he objected to his pretensions to power over kings. In Germany, where fifty years before Catholicism seemed breaking up everywhere and perishing, a great reaction had set in. The powerful prince-bishoprics of Cologne, Osnabruck, and Paderborn, had atoned for defection or hesitation by renewed zeal for Catholicism; and the Reformation

* In quoting this work we shall simply call it "The Life of Sarpi."

had been almost driven from the banks of the Rhine. In Upper Germany wholesale conversions, wrought by the bishops and the Jesuits, had brought Protestantism to a stand-still on the very scenes of the triumphs of Luther himself. Under the Archduke Charles, the "counter-reformation" had rapidly beaten back error in Austria and Styria. The petty princes of the German empire, during the fifteen years preceding the year of which we speak, had been everywhere abjuring heresy and returning to the obedience of the Holy See. Bohemia, Poland, Hungary, were Catholic once more. The power of Spain had preserved the faith of those provinces that are now called Belgium; and if Protestantism was strong in the rising republic of Holland, and within the influence of the great houses of Brandenburg and of Orange, it was becoming rapidly discredited by revolutionary excess and internecine feud. But what was more than all, France was safe. By a wonderful interference of Providence, Henry of Navarre had become a Catholic, and was cordially disposed to the Holy See. Spain was what she had ever been; but her Catholicity was at that time the more proved and constant from the fact that, during all the troubles of the past half-century, her power had been in conflict with the enemies of the Church. It is no wonder, then, that Paul V., an austere and earnest man, bound to no party, and single in his aims, should have thought that the Church of Christ had seen the winter pass away, and that it was for him to speak to the world as became a Supreme Pontiff and Judge. At home, the Italian states and republics were quiet and respectful. Abroad, Spain and France were ready to oppose heresy, and each to check undue liberty on the part of the other. In the Church, the decrees of the Council of Trent were coming into force; more bishops were becoming resident; Catholic preachers, such as Blessed Peter Canisius, were attracting the misled populations; the Society of Jesus was spreading everywhere, with its sermons, its colleges, and its confessional; Baronius and Bellarmin were writing; S. Francis of Sales was alive in Savoy, S. Vincent de Paul in Paris, S. Charles Borromeo had but lately departed from the world, and S. Philip Neri had been living in Rome within the memory of the children in its streets.

On the other hand, in 1605, the giants of the Reformation had all passed away, and in their place there had sprung up a generation of discontented politicians and railing "ministers." Beza, the last of the arch-heretics, had, in this very year, closed a dishonoured old age by an unhappy death. In his own city of Geneva he had left his mantle to such a man as

Diodati, who at this time was preparing that Italian version of the Bible which he smuggled into Italy two years later. Du Plessis-Mornay, a restless intriguer, was troubling the government of Henry IV., though he bore the king's commission; and the French Huguenots in general, like James I., cared less for dogmatic differences than for political privileges. The Protestant literature of the period had changed from the vernacular pamphlet war of Luther to treatises heavy with Calvinism, set off with gross abuse in classical Latin, and generally indebted for their origin and direction to the patron by whom the author was paid. Thus Casaubon was ready at Paris to write in abuse of the Pope, or to stop his work halfway through the press when he was bidden. Melchior Goldast was writing history for the Duke of Saxe. John Pappus was propping the declining fortunes of the Reformation in the free city of Strasburg, whose voice, eighty years before, had joined in the famous original Protestation. But the headquarters of reformation literature at this period was undoubtedly the University of Leyden. The Dutch provinces had become the paradise of Calvinism, and Leyden was the intellectual centre of Holland. There, in the early years of this seventeenth century, was waged the great war between Calvinism and Arminianism; and there Arminius maintained his daring opposition to the Institutes before men who had listened to Calvin himself. There Gomar opposed Arminius, and had the satisfaction of seeing his rival cited before an angry synod at the Hague, and the mortification of knowing that the followers of the Genevan patriarch were henceforward irreconcilably divided. At Leyden, even whilst this battle was raging, and whilst the armies of Philip II. were encamped in Belgium, Joseph Justus Scaliger was teaching Greek, and writing learned but most abusive letters to all parts of Europe. He was a Calvinist, but one on whom his theology sat lightly. His writings, combined with those of his rival Scioppius, are chiefly valuable as a study of the polemical style of the age, and may be said to carry to their utmost development the accomplishment of bad language and the art of defamation. A very different man was Hugo Grotius, who, in 1605, though not more than twenty years old, had already been named historiographer of the States of Holland. Grotius, if he did not at this time live at Leyden, where his father was curator of the University, was part of its society, and has contributed to its fame. He had not then been brought into relation with Petavius, as he afterwards was; for Petavius entered the Jesuit noviciate at Nancy in this very year, 1605. These two great geniuses hardly belong to the age we are now considering,

which had nothing so great as themselves; but in the next generation they summed up the excellence of the two rival parties, of which they were the representative men. We may be allowed to hope, as the Jesuit did, that his gifted friend died at heart a Catholic.

Such, putting out of the question princes like Maurice of Orange and the Elector of Brandenburg, were the leading spirits of the Reformation, in 1605, in France and Germany. Of England, where Beza's friend, the fanatical Whitgift, had died the preceding year, little need be said; and of Italy there is scarcely anything to say. Faustus Socinus, one of the few arch-heretics that owe their birth to Italy, had died in Poland, in 1604, without having effected any permanent damage, either there or in the country of his origin. The Italian cities were free from heresy, although it is certain that a feeling very unfriendly to the Holy See was not rare among the nobility and the lettered classes of those Northern States which were most in communication with heresy, and more or less regularly supplied with the productions of the printing-presses of Geneva and Amsterdam. And this remark finds its most prominent illustration in the Republic of Venice and in the history of Paolo Sarpi.

Venice, in 1605, though no longer what she had been when, half a century before, she had resisted the combined power of France, Spain, and Italy, nor even what she was when, in 1571, her galleys had borne the greater part in the victory of Lepanto, was still a first-rate power in Europe. With her commerce, her fleet, and her power of hiring mercenaries, she could not be despised, and the ambassadors of all the great States, including England, were to be met, except in the case of a quarrel, in the audience-chamber of her ducal palace. Her trading nobility numbered among them the richest men in Europe. In the dominions of the Republic the Catholic religion was splendidly established; but although the Council of Trent had been introduced, it is not evident that the clergy were exemplary or zealous. The people were the slaves of the governing oligarchy. The Venetians were not a literary people. Commerce had made them, and their social life was commerce and pleasure. An unsaleable "idea" or a sacrifice for a principle had little power to affect them, and they believed chiefly in the omnipotence of money and the omniscience of the Council of Ten. Still their presses produced the books that others wrote; and they even kept professional authors to supply the reasons and the apologies that it seemed useful to put forth for the enlightenment of foreign peoples. As merchants and printers, the Venetian nobles could not

afford to scrutinize too closely the principles of their customers and visitors. On the one hand they had generally professed great respect for the Holy See; on the other, they tied the hands of the Holy Office by insisting upon the appointment of one of their own order with a *veto* upon its action. Open rupture with Rome had been very uncommon in Venetian annals. It was therefore a matter of some surprise when it began to be reported, in the latter part of 1605, the date of the accession of Paul V., that Venice, hitherto so submissive, had made up its mind to resist to the utmost certain demands of the Pope. The Signory claimed the right to legislate about the property of the Church, to object to the erection of new churches, and to cite the clergy, in criminal causes, before the tribunals of the State. The Pope denounced these claims, demanded that two ecclesiastics, who were then in the prisons of the Dogana, should be given up to him, and roundly told the Republic that if their laws were such, their laws must be changed. There is no doubt that the Pope was in the right in this contest. Opinions may differ as to the policy of his proceedings. But the circumstances of the times were such as appeared to warrant his boldness in daring to aim at the full liberty of the Church in a State which recognized the Church. For it must be remembered that Venice had accepted the decrees of the Council of Trent. In the twentieth chapter of the last session of the Council, the immunity of ecclesiastics is said to be of *divine right*, and the Council orders the sacred canons, the statutes of General Councils, and the constitutions of the Popes on the subject, to be exactly observed. This is worth observing, because it puts the Venetians at once and entirely in the wrong.

But the resistance of the Venetian oligarchy did not take all at once the shape of a denial of principles. It was at the end of the year 1605 that the Doge and Senate received the admonitory Papal briefs threatening excommunication. At the very moment the Doge died. The new Doge was Leonardo Donato. One of the first acts of the Senate, after the installation of Donato, was to consider the briefs of the Pope. At their meeting a paper was read, which professed to explain the theology and law of the case, and advised them that the Papal censures would be null and void. The writer of this paper was Fra Paolo Sarpi, of the order of the Servi di Maria, and one result of his work was his own immediate appointment as Theologian and Canonist to the Republic of Venice.

Sarpi was at this time in the fifty-fourth year of his age, and was widely known, not only in Venice, but also in Rome and in most of the leading cities of the peninsula. His calling as

a Religious had not prevented him from moving about with great freedom, or from enjoying the best society, and engaging in an extensive correspondence. He was known to be a prodigy of learning; but his learning was by no means universal, and his tastes had led him to physical researches rather than to literature, and much more than to theology. At the early age of fourteen he had entered the religious state, and before he was twenty had given astonishing proofs of his talent in public disputation, unless his friend Fra Fulgenzio has somewhat drawn upon his imagination in describing the scene. He had been honoured by S. Charles Borromeo with a certain share of confidence, and had been permitted to assist the holy archbishop, by advice and action, in the reforms that he carried out in Northern Italy. He had held several offices and dignities in his order, but had managed to quarrel with a large party of his religious brethren. He had endeavoured to reform them, and he had come into violent collision with one of them in matters connected with elections and promotions. It is impossible to say how far it was his own fault, but it is certain that a large party of the Servites were his bitter enemies. This meant much more than that it would mean now. These men were Italians, their monastic professions were none of the strictest, and at the beginning of the seventeenth century violence and the use of the stiletto were very commonly resorted to in Italy to settle a quarrel, political or personal.* At Rome his reputation, up to the year 1605, seems to have been good. Cardinal San Severina, Urban VII., and Sixtus V. had thought favourably of him, and noticed him at one time or another, and Bellarmine always had the sort of generous esteem for him that an able man has for an able opponent. Fra Paolo had already, however, begun to show his bitter hatred of Rome. The malignant letter in cypher, written nineteen years before 1605, of which his biographers give an extract,† cannot have been a solitary specimen. But his whole manner of life for many years before the same period, had been open to grave suspicion. After returning from Rome in 1598, he seems to have withdrawn almost wholly from the concerns of his order, and to have given himself up to learned leisure and literary society. He had left Rome a disappointed man. At any rate, he had been disappointed in a bishopric, and Bellarmine had

* In illustration of this, see the curious scene described by Fra Paolo's biographer (p. 76), in which the brethren of a Servite monastery were with difficulty prevented from attacking a party of *sbirri*.

† Life, p. 58.

been made cardinal, and Fra Paolo had not been made General of the Servites. His favourite place of resort in Venice was the palace of the senator Andrea Morosini, where he was accustomed to meet a choice and brilliant society. The "Ridotto Morosini" was his *club*. Such *réunions* had become the fashion in Italy since the Medicean revival of letters. But the trouble which the Venetian government soon afterwards had with a number of them shows that they tended to become dangerous political meetings. Politics, at that day, included religion; the designs of Spain, the prospects of France, and the "pretensions" of Rome. The company that Fra Paolo met at the Morosini palace and at the Nave d'Oro is not a bad index to the class of opinions discussed. Andrea Morosini himself has written a history of the contest between Venice and the Holy See which occurred at this period, in the spirit of a warm partisan. Leonardo Donato, now Doge of Venice, was, perhaps, the leader of the *coterie*. He had been a school-fellow of Fra Paolo, and he was the acknowledged head of the anti-Roman party in the city. On his coming into power, defiance was at once declared to the Pope. Donato had formerly been ambassador at Rome, and he and his friends now imported into the political contest all the rancour of personal hostility.* But we are not left to conjecture for the description of the matters treated at the meetings of Fra Paolo and his friends. He was already in correspondence with Du Plessis-Mornay, the "Pope of the Huguenots," who from his fortress on the Loire kept France in continual disturbance. In one of his letters to Mornay he thus writes:—"Our chief object is to prevent the Republic from yielding a tittle of its rights, and to gain greater liberty for it. We urge the reading of the Scripture, we commend the merits of Christ, *we make a fool of the Pope*."† Among other correspondents of the same stamp he had De Thou, the "liberal" lawyer, whose "Universal History" was put on the Index by the Pope, and applauded by the Protestants, and De Ferrier, who had not yet discovered, as he afterwards did, that the Huguenots, in this world at least, were the losing party. Another fact both suggests an additional reason for his attitude of disaffection, and proves its existence. In 1598 he again tried to obtain a vacant bishopric. It was refused him. The next year he moved the Signory to make an application for another. He was unsuccessful again. The reasons given by the Holy

* Ranke, *Päpste*, vi. 13.

† *Papam in risu ponimus*. See "*Storia Arcana di F. Paolo*," by M. Fontanini, p. 117.

See for rejecting him are instructive. It was objected by Pope Clement VIII. that Fra Paolo, though a man of culture and ability, was rendered unworthy of the Episcopate by his "commerce with heretics."* A worldly man, who had been thrice refused what he looked upon as a literary sinecure,† will be suspected by men of the world of having been tempted to bitter thoughts. The stories about his free-thinking and atheistical opinions seem to be without sufficient foundation. He seems to have been free, and sometimes scandalous in his talk, fond of argument, and careless of arriving at truth. It is certain that he often maintained, in jest and for purposes of display, theses which were not only contrary to the "Philosophy of Aristotle," but against Christianity itself.‡ Some of his hearers may have been obtuse, and some malignant, but there is no doubt that report spoke much to his disadvantage.

Such were the antecedents of the Frate whom the Venetians might have seen, in the latter part of 1605 and during the succeeding year, passing each day from the convent of the Servi to his cabinet in the ducal palace. He made no great show, yet he seems to have had something remarkable about him. Of middle height, with a large head and round forehead; fresh-coloured and healthy, with a small trim beard, and a face that told of hot blood, Fra Paolo passed to and fro attended by Fra Fulgenzio and, generally, a lay-brother also, as one who carried many state secrets under his monk's frock. As Theologian and Canonist to the Most Serene Republic, he was now in office, with power and pay; and it must be said for him, that he did not take his employers' money without something to show for it. He seemed to be possessed by a passion—a passion which had slightly wavered at times in its object, but which was now set and fixed as Italian passion can grow set and fixed, and his passion was hatred of the Papacy.||

Although the complete history of all that Sarpi wrote and effected during the year of the contest is very interesting, it is too long to give in this place. He wrote tract after tract for the Senate, for the people, against Paul V., against Bellarmin. His style is not elegant, indeed it is often rough; but his order of thought is transparent, and his instances cleverly put. His line of argument is everywhere the same. He denied that the Pope had *any power whatever* over temporal princes; he denied the immunity of the clergy, and he counselled an appeal from the Pope to a General Council.

* Courayer, *Vie de Sarpi*, xlv.

† Life, p. 60.

‡ Life of Fra Paolo Sarpi, p. 84.

|| Ranke, *Papste*, vi. 12.

What we are concerned with, however, is not so much the detail of what Fra Paolo did against the Holy See, about which there is very little disagreement, but the intention or purpose with which he did it. There is a confused idea in the world that the Venetian friar was an honest Catholic,—another Savonarola or Gerson; that he opposed the pretensions of Rome as a Catholic; that he wrote his “*Concilio di Trento*” as a Catholic; and that his assassination was an attempt on the part of the Roman Curia to rid itself by force of an enemy whom they were unable to overcome by argument. On the other hand, it is as clear as anything can be that Fra Paolo was a Protestant at heart, that he was a hypocrite in his profession of Catholicism, that his History is full of misrepresentations, and written to prove the Council of Trent was no council at all; and it can be shown that there is no evidence whatever to connect the blow that struck him in the streets of Venice with the Holy See or any of its officials.

In criticising Fra Paolo's opinions, three classes of his utterances have to be dealt with; first, the open expressions of his opposition to Rome; secondly, his secret avowals to his intimate friends; and thirdly, his protestations of Catholicity.*

The errors of the Servite's public writings have already been summarized. Both Protestants and Catholics admit that he maintains propositions condemned by Rome, as subversive of the Pope's supremacy, and contrary to Holy Scripture and Canon Law. The Roman theologians, with Bellarmine, who replied to him, found in his writings the malice of Luther, and the errors of Marsilius of Padua, and of John Huss. The Roman congregations condemned them as *temerarious*, scandalous, calumnious, seditious, schismatical, erroneous, and heretical.† The Protestants said the same thing, but in very different terms. Casaubon, when he received a bundle of the black little tracts that Fra Paolo had been bringing out in Venice, was pleased and delighted, and prophesied that Venice was on the way to changes in doctrine.‡ Joseph Justus Scaliger, writing from Leyden to Casaubon at Paris, thought that Fra Paolo had given a mortal blow to the Papacy. John Pappus, of Strasburg, translated them into German, for the confirmation of weak brethren in Alsace. Bedell, the chaplain of the English ambassador, writes home

* We must acknowledge our obligations in the following pages to the “*Civiltà Cattolica*,” Serie VI. vol. xi. p. 53, and vol. xii. pp. 264 and 649.

† Ex decreto S. Cong., diei 20 Sept., 1606.

‡ Epist. 477, 480, 484, March 22, 1607.

that Fra Paolo had "in the late controversy served his country so faithfully that the Pope conns him little thanks for his labour."* The following description proves that zealous Protestants were quite expecting Venice to declare for the Reformation; it is from a letter of the secretary of the English Legation.†

Venice is like a new world ; it is the greatest consolation to find oneself in companies and assemblies at the houses of the nobles, and to hear them speak with so much piety and zeal of the truth of God with those good men Father Paolo, Fulgenzio, and Bedell, the chaplain of the ambassador. The sermons in public are as good as could be preached in Geneva. . . . The Inquisition is kept under by a senator, who is a member of it. He is always chosen from the greatest opponents of the Pope. The vehemence against the Pope and the Curia is greater than ever. The Jesuits are denounced from the pulpit, their doctrines refuted and denied, and they mortally disliked : many of the nobles have provided themselves with tutors of the reformed religion. Three-fourths of the nobility are much attached to the truth, and the rest favourably inclined.

If, then, we are to judge a man by the opinion of his friends, Fra Paolo was a Reformer.

But all this is only what appeared externally, and the judgments of men upon it. There is, in addition, an amount of overwhelming evidence to prove that the Servite friar was not only a reforming agitator, but a heretic at heart. He was another Luther, without Luther's animal courage and strength of will.

Fra Fulgenzio was Sarpi's intimate friend, colleague in office, and assistant in policy ; he afterwards wrote his life. This Fra Fulgenzio seems to have been an attractive preacher. At all events, he preached in the interests of his party, daring the interdict, and both before and afterwards. Of the quality of his preaching we may judge from the fact that Asselineau, a Protestant physician, said, after hearing him, "I think God has raised up for Italy another Melancthon or another Luther."‡ And the opinion of Sir Henry Wotton's secretary, that the sermons were quite worthy of Geneva, has already been given. About these sermons, then, Fra Paolo wrote, after Lent in 1609, "Fra Fulgenzio has preached in the way you heard him ten years ago. . . He has done what a truly Catholic preacher ought to do."|| But this language is mild

* Bedell's Letters, New Year's Day, 1607.

† Geneva, Aug. 10, 1608. *Mém. Du Mornay*, vol. x. p. 150.

‡ *Mem. of Du Plessis-Mornay*, x. 292.

|| Letters 25, 26, in the work of Fontanini, cited before.

compared with what Sarpi could occasionally use. He had all the regular catch-words of the reformers. He talked of *the truth*, and *the Gospel*, and *the yoke of servitude*. The Pope was a *tyrant*, his power was *tyranny* and *intolerable oppression*, and the Frate sighed for *the liberty* of England and Germany.* A taste of this liberty, as it really was, would have introduced him to the acquaintance of the Star Chamber and the tender mercies of Dutch Calvinists. But liberty with him, as with more important men, meant liberty for what he had persuaded himself was right, and repression for what any one else thought, more especially those whom he called *Papists*, *Romanists*, and *Pope-worshippers*. He called Catholic piety *superstition*.† Rome is the *harlot*, the *harlot in a mask*; and, in accordance with the contemporary phraseology of Mornay and the Genevan doctors, he uses prophecy for invective, and finds the great harlot and the beast of the Apocalypse verified in the Church of Rome and the Pope.‡ He rejoices to hear of the spread of the Protestant doctrines. When there was question of Styria becoming perverted, he hoped it might come to pass, for Styria was on the frontiers of the Republic, and the "war would easily pass into our own ranks."|| Du Plessis-Mornay, the life and heart of French Calvinism, was one of his most confidential correspondents. To him he laments the slowness of the progress of the good cause, and expresses his joy when fortune favours the Huguenots. He regrets that the Venetians are coming to terms with the Pope; he is sorry for the resignation of Harlay, "a great misfortune for the Reform"; he hopes little from Verdun, as "a favourite of the Pope and the Jesuits." He longs for war in Italy, to put an end to the Inquisition, that the gospel may have free scope. Condé, he hopes, may some day turn Protestant; Sully he praises for his constancy; he commends a governor for "hating the priests"; and he deplores the lot of France, whose queen allowed about her monks and Jesuits.§ Truly it is difficult to say why the sectarian leaders all over Europe should not have treated him as one of themselves; as, indeed, they did. He told M. Gillot that he "wore a mask, because he could not help it."¶ And Diodati heard him say that he did so in order to be better able to sap in secret the doctrines and the authority of the Pope. His opinions about the Jesuits are among other notes of his state of mind. He said that it was essential to ruin the Jesuits; to ruin them was to

* Letters 22, 23, 25, 26.

† Letters 38, 50.

§ Letters 30, 31, 44, 48, 49, 53, 61.

† Letters 47, 49, 50.

|| Letter 17.

¶ Letter 69.

ruin Rome, and, Rome destroyed, religion would reform itself.*

It cannot be doubted, it seems to us, that Sarpi was not a Catholic,† if we are to accept the testimony of his own words, uttered in confidential intercourse with his trusted friends. Even Courayer is forced to admit that he was a Protestant on some points. “A l’imitation d’Erasmus, de Cassander, de M. de Thou, et de plusieurs autres grands hommes, il étoit Catholique en gros, et quelquefois Protestant en détail.”‡ This monstrous description of Catholic is, however, better delineated by Bossuet, who sums up Fra Paolo’s character by saying that he was a Calvinist in a monk’s frock.

The plans and schemes of a great part of his life were quite in accordance with this theory of his belief. He believed that a political quarrel with the Pope was the surest means of bringing about a change of religion. “I believe,” he says to M. de l’Isle Grosloot, “that if it were not for state reasons, there are divers persons who would vault from this pit of Rome to the height of reform; but one fears one thing, another another.”|| He was sorry, therefore, to see the Pope and the Republic coming to terms. He laboured to bring Venice into connection with the elector of Brandenburg. With the help of Mornay he got a Dutch embassy established at Venice. His dearest object was to engage France in a quarrel with Paul V. on the side of the Venetians. But Henry IV. and Cardinal du Perron would not peril their newly-won orthodoxy by a contest with Rome; and when Fra Paolo saw that at length the Supreme Pontiff and the Republic were reconciled, it almost broke his heart.§ Sarpi did not neglect England in his calculations. King James had promised assistance, through his ambassador, in case the Signory should go to war with Paul V. But England was too far off to count for much; and the chief use made of the proffered assistance of the king was when Fra Paolo arranged with him, through Casaubon, for being received in England if Venice should ever become an undesirable place of abode. There was another little way in which the lofty-minded Frate helped on the good cause: he very much approved of

* Letter, July 5, 1611.

† Ranke thinks he was; but if Sarpi, as Ranke admits, only believed the Confession of Augsburg, it is difficult to see how this could be.

‡ Courayer, *Vie de Sarpi*, lxii.

|| “Credo che se non fosse per ragion di Stato, si troverebbero diversi che salterebbero da questa fossa di Roma nella cima della Riforma; ma chi tema una cosa, chi un altra.”—Feb. 18, 1612.

§ For this strong expression, see the “Life of Bedell,” by Burnet.

smuggling forbidden books. From Switzerland, from the Tyrol, and from Styria, heretical works could pass the Venetian frontier with more or less ease. Sarpi's letters often contain anxious allusions to "forbidden books," "other sorts of books," the best road for "books," the hands and eyes that may meddle with "the books," and "very good books," which the correspondent is warned not to send just then.* He was skilful in getting a parcel of "the right sort of books" (*libri di vaglia*) slipped in among the baggage of an ambassador coming from Turin or beyond the Alps, and so avoiding all risk of having them discovered and confiscated.†

Amongst all the proofs, however, of Fra Paolo's *mens heretica*, none is so strong as the testimony of his English friends. To fix definite doctrines upon a Reformer is the most difficult thing in the world, for the single reason that his mind is generally in a state of transition, and what seemed to him true to-day will appear false to-morrow. But when a man, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, denounces the tyranny of the Pope and the yoke of the Church, when he numbers Mornay among his friends and Bellarmine among his opponents, we cannot be far wrong in saying that his renouncing Catholicity is only a question of time and opportunity. So, also, when we find Sarpi engaged in intimate relations with a society whose undoubted and avowed object is "reformation," if he had not left a word of his own mouth, we could not be mistaken in judging him to be one who, consciously or otherwise, had withdrawn the obedience of his mind from the authority of the Roman Catholic Church.

Sir Henry Wotton was sent to Venice as ambassador by James I. in 1602, that is, about three years before the Interdict. He was, of course, a Protestant; and a residence of several years at Geneva, where he had sat at the feet of Beza, and had known Casaubon and Diodati, had imbued him with what might be expected to be the perfect spirit of Calvinism. His chaplain was the well-known Dr. William Bedell, afterwards Bishop of Kilmore, in which latter capacity he is stated to have been ardent and successful in his efforts to pervert the Catholic clergy of Ireland. Bedell became an intimate friend of Fra Paolo, who admitted him "to his cell and his studies." The Frate taught him Italian; and the English divine attempted to teach Sarpi English, in which it does not appear that he succeeded. He made up, however, for any such failure by teaching Fra Paolo a variety of other things, of which the latter remarks, with much significance, that he

* Letters 7, 45, 33, 39.

† Letter 47.

had "learned more from him than from any other divine."* What the things were, and what were the general aims of these two worthies, we are fortunately enabled to see from a work published after Bedell's death, and entitled "Some Original Letters of Bishop Bedell concerning the steps taken toward a Reformation of Religion at Venice upon occasion of the quarrel between that State and Paul V." (Dublin, 1742.) These letters show us a reformation in the bud. That the promise never bore fruit is a subject of loud lamentation from the lady who is Fra Paolo's latest biographer. "Venice," she says, "had missed the golden opportunity of freeing herself from the Court of Rome; it cost her dear."† The innovating party included, besides the two Servites and the English chaplain, Sir Henry Wotton himself; Diodati, the Genevan minister (who had come to Venice at Wotton's solicitation); two or three other persons from Geneva; and a M. Papillon, sent from Saumur, the residence of the arch-Huguenot M. Du Plessis-Mornay. Its aims and designs are stated by Bedell as follows:—

The first. To maintain the States here in heart and courage against the Pope, and that which they most fear, the power of Spain, by which he is backed.

The second. To increase the number of those that have received any light of the truth.

The third. To formalize and unite into some body of a congregation, some part at least of that great number who now stand alienated in heart and tongue from Rome.

Bedell thought that reformation by "persuasion of conscience," as distinguished against reformation by a State process, though a great work and a slow one, might be much expedited by the excellence and dexterity of a few:—

Some there are here as admirably fitted thereto as could be wished; Master Paulo and his scholar, Fulgentio, Servites, both of great learning, piety . . . and . . . in great account with all sorts. . . . These two I know, as having practised with them, *to desire nothing in the world so much as the reformation of the Church*, and, in a word, for the substance of religion *they are wholly ours*. What effect now the force of truth may have in the mouths of such men, I leave for your consideration.

Speaking of Diodati, Bedell says:—

He had divers meetings and conferences with the Fathers Fra Paolo, &c., at which both myself and this bearer were present. He can report to you the particulars of the points discussed.

* Life, p. 130.

† P. 130.

It was told him (Diodati) by M. Paulo, that no fewer than 12,000 in this city were enlightened more or less with the truth and alienated from Rome. That yet among the nobility, nothing could be moved until there were some occasion of breach with the Pope ; with them, therefore, he would not that he should yet deal, but with others to whom he should be brought, chiefly merchants, Germans, Flemings, French, of whom, not long before, a certain French gentleman had made a list, with the several sums they would contribute to a minister, that he might try the disposition of as many as he could. Yet, for his part, he thought the matter not yet disposed to receive such a form as was to be desired. He propounded first other meetings to be used by way of conscience and talk, whereby men might come to know one another, and inform themselves better of religion ere any exercises were erected.

The French gentleman, M. Papillon, seems to have been the occasion of the spreading of a premature report, and of "filling all the Reformed Churches of France with the noise" that Venice was about to declare for the reform. His zeal, which was "animated by M. Paulo," led him to underrate the difficulties of the work. Of the converts, some drew back when they foresaw danger ; others, "although making profession, were known to live scandalously." Bedell pressed for the formation of a congregation. A form of abnegation or confession of faith was drawn up ; a "sum of the Scriptures," without Romish corruption, was already in use among orthodox Venetians ; and for a liturgy they could use the form of the French churches, or the English Book of Common Prayer, lately translated into Latin by Bedell himself. A minister was wanted. Diodati said he was only reader of divinity and of Hebrew, not a minister ; and, besides, he thought he should do more good at Geneva. *The Fathers* (Sarpi and Fulgenzio) would not listen to Bedell's offer of himself. He was chaplain to an ambassador, and the more he kept out of sight the better. Eventually, no minister was named. Diodati went back to Geneva, promising to send "young scholars," who should spread Protestantism by teaching in private houses. Fra Paolo could not be persuaded to take a decisive and final step. He continued to read, to write seditious letters, and to wish for something to happen. He assiduously "instructed" Fulgenzio and the rest of those seven divines who had been on his side in the controversy of the Interdict ; he promised Bedell, "if they made a full retreat from the Church of Rome," to have the Anglican Prayer-book adopted by the Republic ; but he declined to put himself in the van of a revolution. "God had not given him the spirit of the German reformer," he said, when some one urged him to take stronger measures. It is no pleasant feature in Sarpi's character, this hypocritical

hanging back. He had begun to speak two languages as early as the days before the Interdict. He wrote, at that time, to Mornay in these terms :—

Nothing helps us so much as his [the Pope's] anger. Let him only publish the Interdict ! The King of France did us an ill turn in persuading him that he would gain more by a different course. He took the advice. At present, he is nothing but kindness. The consequence is that affection for the harlot is beginning to revive, and good people do nothing. God gives to His Word what efficacy He pleases ; but, humanly speaking, only little things come about in time of peace. The King of France either favours the harlot, or he keeps his ideas very much to himself.

This racy outburst of nature almost reminds us of that "German reformer" whom Fra Paolo admired at a distance. But it was strictly private ; there was no nailing to a church door, or reading from a pulpit, or printing it in popular broad-sheets. What the Venetian said when he wrote for print was such as the following, written shortly afterwards :—

Princes are set by God in States as His lieutenants, and He has given them their greatness, and created them at the same time the preservers, protectors, defenders, and upholders of Holy Church. We, by God's singular grace, are placed within the Apostolic and Roman Church, holy and good ; wherefore we should recognize this as a divine favour, and thank God for it without ceasing ; and His anger could send us no greater misfortune than that we should leave it.

This is what men generally term hypocrisy, or rather, double-dealing. We see here a man who said one thing and thought another, a man whom Homer's Pagan hero would have hated "like the gates of hell." Fra Paolo Sarpi was not a Luther, merely because he was a coward. He was one whom ambition, or worldly science, or the charms of polite society and easy living, or all these combined, had perverted from an original good purpose, and whom the circumstances of the times and of Protestant connections had drawn by degrees into the slippery ways of heresy. Because the Roman *curia* was not immaculate,* he made overtures to Geneva. Because he found out that cardinals were unknown in the primitive Church, he took counsel with Anglican ministers about the Gospel of Christ. Because the head of the Church claimed to govern the clergy of the Church, he invited his countrymen to turn themselves into a Protestant sect. And all the time he pretended to be a Catholic.

* See, however, the testimony of Ranke to the state of the Papal Court at this period.—Päpste, iv. 10.

After what has been said as to the religious views of Fra Paolo, it does not seem necessary to say much about his History of the Council of Trent. To expect a man of such anti-Papal leanings to write a fair history of the Pope's Council would be to expect the impossible.* Sarpi and Pallavicino differ in principles, and could not, therefore, help differing in the application of principles, in assigning motives, and in colouring facts. What the former calls a usurped pretension, the latter calls a sacred right. What the one calls intrigue, the other calls prudence, or outspoken honesty. When the Bishops agree, Sarpi calls it servitude, Pallavicino the guidance of the Holy Spirit. As to the respective trustworthiness of the Venetian and the Roman in questions of mere fact, it is obviously impossible to say anything without entering into long and minute details. But there are two writers, both standing high in the judgment of literary men, whose testimony may be here brought forward. The Protestant Ranke, in an appendix to the fourth book of his history of the Papacy, gives an elaborate analysis of the merits of the two hostile historians. His opinion of Cardinal Pallavicino is not unfavourable. He says that he has examined many of the MS. sources from which Pallavicino drew his materials, and that it is only doing him justice to say that the extracts he has made from the instructions and other official documents are "scrupulously exact," and that he has "carefully consulted the whole of the documents." He goes on to say, it is true, that the Roman Cardinal has had recourse to some (unimportant) suppressions, and that he has rather played the part of an advocate than of an historian, by colouring details and explaining away unpleasant circumstances. But what does the German writer say of Sarpi? His judgment is too long to quote entire, but it may be summed up in a few words. Sarpi's chief authority, whom he generally not only uses but translates, is Sleidan (the fanatical Protestant chronicler of the preceding half-century, whom Charles V. called one of "his liars"). In quoting, in piecing together, or otherwise using his documentary materials, "he adds his own observations thereto." After quoting one of these dishonest additions, which no one who had not seen the original of the piece in question would have supposed to have been

* It has been recently stated that the *Times* newspaper had at first intended its Roman intelligence, during the time of the Vatican Council, to be supplied by a certain well-known anti-Roman writer. Gallenga and Sarpi would have almost been matched.

anything but part of it, Ranke adds :—" All the reflections are generally in this style; they are all full of gall and hatred." " His whole history is inspired by the disposition of his mind; that is to say, by systematic opposition and violent hatred against the Court of Rome." When he copies Milledonne, he leaves out the " praises " that Milledonne bestows. He is skilful in arrangement; but at the same time " it is evident that he does his best to produce an impression unfavourable to the Council." He takes expressions and whole sentences out of one context and fits them on to another. " It is undeniable," says Ranke, " that this manner of proceeding often falsifies the truth." Sometimes he literally *invents*, and at other times he so transposes a sentence of an emperor or of an ambassador that the meaning is totally reversed: " His work," concludes the historian of the Papacy, " is the first example of a history written with a set purpose of distortion of facts, uniformly applied to everything."

The other writer to whom allusion has been made is the well-known living Italian historian Cesare Cantù. In his " History of Italian Heretics," the eminent writer alludes to Ranke's censure of Sarpi, and then continues as follows :—" He writes a parody, not a history, of the most celebrated assembly that has ever been. Things of supernal importance he reduces to the proportion of an intrigue; he makes them turn on a manœuvre, on a " cold," on a happy trick, on an eloquent speech, on a creation of cardinals, on the utterance of some strange foreign bishop, on the management of the President in smothering or shelving unpleasant questions. . . . He contradicts Catholic dogma; he upholds private interpretation of Scripture; he rejects the deuterocanonical books; he sneers at the Vulgate; he separates exegesis from patristic interpretation. In the matter of original sin, of grace, of justification, and other dogmas, he literally copies Martin Chemnitz, a heretic, and one of the bitterest opponents of the Council. Not only polemical adversaries but friendly commentators convict him of gross error; and this without taking into account the systematic manufacture of long speeches, that were either never spoken at all, or spoken by entirely different persons from those into whose mouth he puts them. . . . One of the many artifices of Fra Paolo is to broach something that is undoubtedly heretical, not in his own person, but either making some one else say it, or else narrating it as a doctrine neither approved nor condemned, or backing it up with reasons that make it look more plausible. . . . He arranged every-

thing, not to bring out the truth, but so as to be able, without absolutely altering documents, to serve the purposes of his own systematic opposition and the political interests of his country.”*

Yet this is the history from which the English public have learned nearly all that they know about the Council of Trent. This is the history which forms the basis of brilliant articles on the Reformation, which furnishes the groundwork of essays on Papal policy, and which affords materials for the comparisons of those who foretell failure for the Council of the Vatican, because their oracle has told them of the failure of the Council of Trent. Seldom quoted, and still more rarely read, it has nevertheless become a part of English literature, and has passed into the Protestant tradition. It is, in some sense, an English book. It first saw the light, not in Venice, but in London. Fra Paolo's friend, Antonio de Dominis, who from Archbishop of Spalatro became an Anglican rector and archdeacon, having obtained a copy of the MS., had it printed in London in 1619, and dedicated it to King James I., concealing the author's name under the anagram “Pietro Soave Polano.” It is stated that it was against the will of Fra Paolo, and much to his regret, both that it was printed and that it was prefaced by words of invective against the Catholic Church. It is absurd to imagine that he had spent his time and labour over a work of such extent and yet never intended to have it printed. The MS. copy now in the Venetian archives is not indeed in his own handwriting, but it is annotated throughout by himself so continuously that he must have read and approved every word of it. It is certain† that Fra Paolo had sent a copy to England, whether by De Dominis or not. His anger at its publication is perfectly capable of explanation. He had meant his history to look like the work of a Catholic addressed to Catholics. We may well imagine his wrath when the obtuse Anglican proselyte who brought it out prefixed a perfectly Protestant title and preface. The wolf had been prematurely stripped of his sheep's clothing by the short-sighted anxiety of a disciple to show what a clever wolf he was.‡ The blundering preface and title were withdrawn in subsequent editions and translations. The first English version appeared in 1669.||

* Translated from “Gli Eretici in Italia,” Disc. xlvii.

† Courayer, Preface, ii.

‡ Courayer, Preface, iii.

|| The following extract from a letter written by Dr. Oliver Plunkett, Archbishop of Armagh (who was executed for the pretended plot in 1681), to

For the last sixteen years of his life, Fra Paolo Sarpi bore about him a large scar upon his right cheek, which told of a murderous blow, aimed, apparently, at the neck, but which had struck the right ear and pierced the face, coming out close beside the nose. He received it, together with many others not visible, on the evening of the 5th of October, 1607, on his way home from his official duties at the ducal palace. This attempt at assassination has lent the lustre of martyrdom to a character that stands greatly in need of the strong and the heroic. It has, moreover, confirmed, in minds which were already convinced, the worst accusations of its victim against the theory and practice of Rome. It must be observed, however, that all historians with a character to lose approach the story with a wary step. No writer has ever produced a scrap of direct evidence to prove that the Pope was the instigator of the deed. And many are honest enough to confess as much.* Still, the general practice is to dwell upon certain points of circumstantial proof, and to then say that there is certainly nothing to be surprised at if the dagger that struck the patriotic Servite was sharpened at the Vatican. Before giving a brief opinion upon the evidence produced, we must first remind the reader that the author from whom nearly all Sarpi's biographers have copied is Fra Fulgenzio Micanzio, a man who—as cannot be doubted from what has been before stated—was a sharer in all the heresy, passion, and prejudice of Fra Paolo himself. This consideration leads us to form two canons of evidence; first, that an unsupported assertion

Cardinal Cybo, dated Dublin, Aug. 11, 1677, is the earliest extant Catholic opinion on the English translation of Sarpi's "Council of Trent."

... "I pray your Eminence to inform his Holiness (Innocent XI.) that there has been lately published here, in English, in a new form, the pestiferous history of Soave, which is a continual tirade against the Popes, and against the Council of Trent, with the life of that impostor, as though he were a hero. As the poison has been thus spread, an antidote is necessary. Such would be the history of the same Council by Cardinal Pallavicino if translated into English. Should the duty of translating it be imposed on Dr. Leyburne, auditor of His Eminence Cardinal Howard, he being a learned man and versed in the English, Latin, and Italian languages, would perform the task most successfully. You cannot imagine what injury has been done by that pest of a writer, Soave; all the nobility, gentry, merchants, &c., read his history, and it is the more detrimental as it pretends to be written by a religious of our communion. I request you once more to propose this matter to the Holy Father, that without delay the necessary remedy may be provided, which, indeed, would be the above-mentioned translation. . . Dr. Moran's *Memoirs of Archbishop Plunkett*, p. 16.

* This is acknowledged by the writer of an article on Sarpi in the late "Chronicle"; an article in other respects animated by no love of Rome.

of Fulgenzio, in a matter where such prejudice or such passion is concerned, is entitled to very slender respect; secondly, that an assertion of the same author, omitted, or, *à fortiori*, contradicted by a subsequent writer who was acquainted with his work, is entitled to no respect at all.

Before the commencement of the tragedy, two mysterious warnings are said to have bidden Fra Paolo (and his admiring historian) to look painfully towards Rome. The Frate was admonished that danger was at hand, first by Cardinal Bellarmin, next by Gaspar Scioppius. Happily the circumstances with which the assertion as to Bellarmin is surrounded prove its falsehood. Bellarmin is reported to have said words to the effect that Sarpi and himself were honourable opponents, "each striving to advance the interests of his own prince."* The great controversialist could not have said this, because he had already said that Fra Paolo taught what was heretical and scandalous. As to Scioppius, that master of abusive language did at this time get into trouble and into prison at Venice; but that he gave Sarpi any warning as to danger from Rome, we have only Fra Fulgenzio's unsupported word; and Siri substitutes "a certain personage" for Scioppius, and makes such personage Bellarmin's messenger.

Fulgenzio makes the murderers take refuge in the palace of the Papal Nuncio. The report sent to their ambassador at Paris by the Signory says the same thing. These authorities also state that, upon the news of the attempt becoming known, the populace flocked to the Nuncio's palace, and threatened him with shouts and cries, and that in consequence a guard had to be set over the house. All this is contradicted by the Nuncio himself, whose letters we fortunately have. On the 6th of October, the day after the outrage, he wrote no fewer than *nine* letters to Cardinal Borghese. He could hardly have done this had he been in fear of his life from an angry mob. In one of the letters he says: "Last evening Frate Paolo the Servite was stabbed with two or three blows of a stiletto: it is thought he is not in danger of death, but nothing certain is yet known. The signors of the Council of Ten, who are drawing up the process, according to public report, have indicted some persons who, it is believed, have committed the crime. There is great talk about it in the city; and people are very much grieved, as he was greatly beloved." This is a calm letter for a man to write under the fear of wreck and bloodshed. If the Nuncio had been threatened, he could not have omitted to mention it in a confidential

* Siri, *Memorie recondite*, vol. i. p. 432.

letter to his employers at home. In the letters which follow, dated the 13th, the 20th, and the 27th of the same month of October, in which the Roman authorities are kept acquainted with all the turns of the case, still no mention is made of personal danger.*

After the murderous attempt, Fulgenzio says that one of the principal murderers was received into the service of Cardinal Borghese at Rome. In this assertion he is contradicted by the Venetian report. He tells us, also, that Poma, who was apparently the leader of the gang, was paid 10,000 *scudi* in Ancona, together with rewards of other kinds. Here, again, the Servite is totally unsupported:

It appears, then, that nearly the whole of the circumstantial evidence that fixes the crime on Rome rests on the authority of Fra Fulgenzio, and that the small amount which is confirmed is confirmed by the secret report sent to the Venetian ambassador at Paris. Now it is well known that this report goes to the length of actually charging the Pope and the Jesuits with the assassination, and that it was expeditiously circulated everywhere among the French Huguenots.† May it not be conjectured that the report was inspired by Fra Paolo himself, or his friend Fulgenzio?

The one, and the only fact tending to criminate the Pope, of which there is no reasonable doubt, is that the assassins fled into the Papal states, and were not at once seized and punished; but there was nothing really extraordinary in this. At that time there was no such thing as a settled law of the extradition of criminals between any two European states. In the states of the Church, as in the dominions of the Republic, there were then numbers of persons at large who had committed crime against some foreign government. When a criminal was given up, it was only by special arrangement between the powers concerned. Now Venice had not even asked the Roman government to seize or surrender the assassins of Fra Paolo.‡ Venice herself was at that very moment in the wrong, for she was refusing to surrender to the ecclesiastical courts those offenders whom the Pope had cited to appear, and this was contrary to the law of the Republic itself, which had received the Council of Trent; and finally, the Signory, in their own acts, and more especially by their proclamations

* MSS. of the Borghese family, quoted *Civiltà Cattolica*, Series 12, p. 630.

† Letter from Paris, 12th November, 1607, in the Borghese archives.

‡ See a despatch of Alincourt to Champigny, 3rd November, 1607. (Siri, vol. i. p. 440.)

against the murderers, had used language injurious to the Holy See in approving of the works of Sarpi, and had violated the ecclesiastical immunity by inserting in the sentence the name of a priest.*

The confidential correspondence of the Venetian ambassador at Rome, Contarini, commencing with October 13th, 1607, that is, two days after he had heard of the murder attempted on the 5th, is now before us. Contarini was of the same party as Fra Paolo, and was highly approved of by him. In these letters, then, if anywhere, should we expect to find proofs of the complicity of the Roman authorities. But we look for them in vain. Cardinal Pinelli, the head of the Holy Office, is reported, in one letter (October 13th), to have expressed his regret at hearing of Fra Paolo's misfortune. He said he bore him no ill-will, and had invited him to come to Rome, promising him attention and kindness. He feared that it might be supposed, not by the Senate or the educated classes, but by the populace, that the blow had come from Rome—an idea that could not be entertained by sensible men, for there was no example of such a thing, in word or deed, in any age, and the Church did not proceed by these indirect and diabolical ways. But he was concerned about what the common people would think, ready, as they are, for every sinister notion.† He added that he thought it likely that the murder might have been planned by some of his own brethren, urged by anger and monkish revenge, and that his opinion was shared by Cardinal Zappata, with whom he had held a long conversation. In another letter orders are said to have been given that the suspected assassins should leave Rome in an hour.‡ Under the date of the 24th of November, the envoy sends a rumour about certain rewards to be given by order of the Pope to the assassins; he adds that he is unable to ascertain the truth of the report.|| This is, in substance, all that the anxious ambassador could find out, after employing spies, spending money, opening private letters, and using every means that a Venetian ambassador of the period knew very well how to use. He seldom gets beyond "it is said," or "I have been told"; and the greater part of his information consists in minute but totally unimportant particulars about changes of residence or locality in the suspected persons. In one of his letters he gives some words used by the Pope himself. Paul V. told the

* See, in the "Life of Sarpi," the proclamation quoted p. 157, and the sentence, App. p. 240.

† Translation from the Italian. See *Civiltà Cattolica*, loc. cit. p. 663. A bad translation is given in the Life, p. 158.

‡ Life, p. 159.

|| Life, p. 161.

French ambassador that the event had vexed him, not because he did not wish to see M. Paolo punished,* but because he did not wish the punishment to have taken that shape, since there would be plenty of malicious people to interpret things in a bad sense, putting their own interpretation on what had happened; and if the thing had been originated by anybody's zeal, he considered it to be an indiscreet and mad zeal.†

Who was it, then, that directed the murderous attack upon the Servite? It will be remembered that Fra Paolo had deeply offended a large number of unruly and passionate friars. It is certain (as far as one can be certain of anything on the authority of Fra Fulgenzio) that, a year or two after the attempted assassination, other attempts were made on his life, and this time the names of the criminals are given, and they are *Servite friars*.‡ Now Cardinal Pinelli, as head of the Inquisition, may be supposed to have known a good deal about the late quarrels in the order of the Servi, more especially since Cardinal San Severina, his predecessor, had been intimately concerned with them. Are we, then, to adopt his opinion and that of his brother cardinal, and conclude that Fra Paolo was nearly falling a victim to the vengeance of his unhappy religious brethren? Even if it be granted that there is not sufficient evidence for this, surely a street assassination in Venice in the year 1607 is not such a very unusual thing as to demand the incontrovertible proof of a motive.

For a few years in the early part of the seventeenth century it looked as if Venice were about to bid defiance to the Pope and throw in her lot with the Reformation. Geneva, the Hague, the Huguenots, and the Anglicans, were high with hope. Rome was daily expecting the worst. But the critical days passed, and Venice remained to the Church. Humanly speaking, Fra Paolo came too late. Protestantism had already passed its flood, and the ebb was leaving wide tracts of Europe once more to the occupation of the Church. If it were permitted to seek for a higher cause, it might be added that the ancient republic had been the first European power that received the decrees of Trent, and that she had poured out her blood in the Catholic battle of Lepanto. She was not allowed to suffer for the sins of her rulers, and she lived on to die, when she did die, Catholic to the last.

* The *Chronicle* translates this, "Not because he did not wish him evil." The original is "*Non già perchè non desiderasse di veder M. Paolo castigato.*"

† Letter of 27th October, 1607.

‡ Life of Sarpi, p. 182.

ART. IV.—MR. RENOUF'S REPLY ON POPE HONORIUS.

The Case of Pope Honorius reconsidered with reference to Recent Apologies.
By PETER LE PAGE RENOUF. London: Longmans.*

CONSIDERING the vast amount of reading which Mr. Renouf has accumulated on the Honorius question, we were at first surprised that he had not been able to put together a more plausible argument than is contained in the pamphlet before us. But on reflection, we have come to account for its extraordinary weakness, by supposing that his multifarious studies have somewhat confused and bewildered his mind on the whole inquiry.

He is rather fond indeed of throwing in our teeth our comparative unacquaintance with "the literature of the subject." But this objection, we think, proceeds on a fundamental misconception of what a periodical reviewer has to do. The present writer willingly admits, that when Mr. Renouf's first pamphlet appeared, he had no fuller knowledge of Monothelism than of the other thousand heresies which have disfigured ecclesiastical history. But it will always be found, that an unsound theological writer—quite apart from the more recondite details of his immediate theme—offends broadly against known truths of theology and against fixed laws of reasoning; and it is the business of his reviewer in a periodical to point out those errors. If the reviewer had to wait and first study profoundly "the whole literature of the subject," more than one undesirable result must ensue. Such errors as those to which we refer, instead of being exposed at once, would remain unchallenged for an indefinite period; other theological scandals would have to pass unnoticed; and at last, when the reviewer had equipped himself at all points to meet the original assailant, his comment would be found extending to a much greater length than a periodical could admit. The necessities of our position, then, entirely forbid such a course. In January we have to write on the Monothelite heresy; in April on the Procession of the Holy Ghost: in each case drawing on our current knowledge of theology and history, and assisted only by such special study as there may happen to be time for.

We should say in most cases that a periodical writer is, for this reason, in a position of considerable disadvantage; and it is certain

* F. Gratry and other Catholics on the continent have recently been treating the Honorius question. But we think it will be more convenient to comment on them separately in our "Notices"; and to confine the present article, which was in type before F. Gratry's pamphlet had appeared, to our own personal controversy with Mr. Renouf.

that he is always especially liable to fall into this or that incidental mistake, however great pains he may take to avoid it. But in the present instance we really doubt, whether our comparative ignorance is not more serviceable than Mr. Renouf's great acquired knowledge. We flatter ourselves that we look at the admitted facts of the case in a straightforward and unsophisticated way; whereas Mr. Renouf seems hardly able to contemplate *facts* at all, through the perplexity caused him by that endless multiplicity of *comments* which has come under his notice.

His theses are three in number. He alleges firstly (pp. 11-41), that Honorius is proved by his Letters to have professed Monothelism; secondly (pp. 42-68), that Honorius was condemned by the Church as a Monothelite; and thirdly (pp. 69-90), that Honorius taught Monothelism *ex cathedrâ*. For the purpose of vindicating the dogma of Pontifical infallibility, it is amply sufficient of course to disprove his *third* thesis. But as we are convinced that all three are mistaken—the first and third indeed extravagantly so—it will be more satisfactory to confront them successively. We cannot pretend of course, within the limits of an article, to notice every single statement contained in a pamphlet of a hundred pages. Nor again will it be necessary for us even to touch Mr. Renouf's swaggering and pretentious assaults on F. Bottalla; because that very distinguished theologian mentions, in a letter to the "Tablet," that he himself intends to take the matter in hand. But we believe it will be found that we have not avoided any one argument adduced by Mr. Renouf for either of his theses.

Firstly then, Mr. Renouf maintains that Honorius is proved by his Letters to have professed Monothelism. And for the purpose of exhibiting this fact, he reasonably enough enters on various inquiries as to the genuine doctrines of that heresy. We have been surprised however at his singular self-contradiction on this head; and this is the first point to which we would direct attention.

"The whole controversy," he says (p. 19, note), "really turned on the question, whether the will is to be attributed to the *person* or to the *nature*." We do not see how this sentence can be otherwise understood, than as affirming that all the Monothelites regarded the will as exclusively attributable to the *person*.* So in

* Yet our author proceeds to lay down as the Monothelite tenet, that "the duality of wills in human personality is a result of the Fall." Why the Fall only affected man's *nature*; and Mr. Renouf has affirmed that Monothelites regarded the will as attributable only to the *person*. "Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?"

On the "Σίλημα ὑποστατικόν" and "γνωμικόν," as distinguished from "φυσικόν," see Petavius's ninth book, De Incarnatione, c. 7. See also F. Bottalla, p. 15.

p. 20 he says that the Monothelites thus argued: "there is but one Person in Christ, therefore there is but one will." But if all this be so, they must have considered that in the *nature* there exists no *faculty* of willing whatever; and that God the Son, when He assumed human nature in its integrity, assumed no human faculty of willing. Yet on this point—which he considers a "most important" one—only six pages earlier (p. 12, note), Mr. Renouf had expressed the precisely opposite opinion. He had maintained confidently (against Petavius and the great body of scholastics) that the Monothelites did ascribe to Christ a human *faculty* of willing. But his inconsistency does not end here. In the note just cited he professes agreement with Vasquez and Lugo; and *their* opinion is, that the Monothelites admitted indeed in Christ a human *faculty* of willing, but denied Him to have elicited human *acts* of will. Nevertheless, in two different places (p. 12, note; p. 19, note) Mr. Renouf implies that all which the Monothelites denied to Christ was a *free* human will. Here then are three discrepant opinions, ascribed to the whole Monothelite body by Mr. Renouf: (1) that Christ has no human *faculty* of willing; (2) that He has the faculty, but never elicited human *acts* of will; (3) that He elicited human acts, only not *free* acts.

The question whether the Monothelites did or did not ascribe to Christ a human *faculty* of willing, is external to our argument; and we shall express on it no opinion: but as to *free* will, we must entirely demur to Mr. Renouf's last implication. No doubt the Monothelites, in denying to Christ all human acts of will, denied to Him inclusively all *free* acts; nor again do we at all deny, that the doctrine of Christ's human liberty *follows* legitimately from what was defined against Monothelism. But if Mr. Renouf really means, that Monothelites ascribed to Christ human acts of will, and that they only denied the *freedom* of those acts,—we are more amazed than we can express. No other source of information on Monothelistic tenets can approach in authenticity to the testimony of S. Martin I. and his Lateran Synod; and four different canons of that Synod set forth the doctrine of "the wicked heretics." What is that doctrine? They "deny and reject" Christ's "two wills and operations, the divine and human" (can. 14); they regard "the theandrical energy" as "a single and not double operation" (can. 15); they uphold "one will and operation of Christ's divinity and humanity" (can. 18). In fact, if it is the denial of Christ's human *liberty* which constitutes Monothelism, then Monothelism was never condemned, either by S. Martin I. or by the Sixth Council: for not one syllable is to be found in either definition concerning Christ's human liberty.*

* We may safely infer indeed from the Sixth Council's definition, that the question of liberty occupied no prominent place in the controversies against

We shall assume therefore as sufficiently demonstrated, that the Monothelites denied our Blessed Lord to have elicited any human acts of will whatever; and conversely, we shall assume that no one was involved in that heresy, who admitted the existence of such acts.

There are one or two further points of doctrine which Mr. Renouf's pamphlet makes it necessary to consider, in order that we may vindicate the faultless orthodoxy of Honorius's Letters. To these we now proceed.

In January, 1869 (pp. 185-7) we drew out, to the best of our power, the practical exhibition of Monothelism. No one who admits the correctness of our exposition, can assent for a moment to Mr. Renouf's opinion (p. 12) that, before this heresy arose, "the tradition of the Church had not been so clear and explicit as to leave no room for doubt." We must maintain on the contrary, that, so soon as Monothelism was correctly apprehended, it was at once seen to contradict directly a large body of vital dogma, which had been enforced as of faith from the very Apostolic age. No doubt—as in the parallel case of Arianism—individual Fathers of earlier centuries had occasionally used incautious expressions, which admitted afterwards of Monothelistic perversion; but this arose from the very fact, that the Monothelistic tenet was so utterly external to their thoughts and imagination. We say this in protest against Mr. Renouf: and we say it without attempt at proof, because neither does Mr. Renouf attempt proof for his own most paradoxical opinion. In like manner we protest against his assertion (p. 12), that "the Monothelite leaders were one and all sincerely attached to the creed of the Church, as laid down by the Council of Chalcedon." We follow the enormous majority of Catholic writers in holding, that Monothelism was a mere offshoot of the Eutychian heresy; that its leaders could not consistently and straightforwardly accept (as they *professed* to accept) the Chalcedonian Definition; and that their whole reasoning was in consequence confused and self-contradictory. But on all this we cannot reply to Mr. Renouf's arguments, for he has *adduced* none.

There is one more point of doctrine however, started by Mr. Renouf, to which we must refer. "According to orthodox theology," he says (p. 21, note), "there was in Christ '*contrarietas voluntatum simpliciter*.'"^{*} But the Sixth Council defines, that His "two natural wills are *not* mutually contrary (*God forbid!*), as the *impious heretics asserted*." In January, 1869 (pp. 193-5) we set

Monothelism. The Council defines that His "human will was *subject* to His divine and omnipotent will." They could not have spoken thus unqualifiedly and without explanation, if they had felt it an important part of their work to vindicate the *liberty* of His human will.

* In fairness we must mention that he italicises the word "*simpliciter*."

forth what we understood to be the Catholic dogma on this particular subject; and we should have been glad if our opponent had distinctly stated how far he concurs with it. Still more glad should we have been, if he had given his opinion on Dr. Dollinger's dictum to which we there referred. Dr. Dollinger implies that, during His Agony, Christ forgot for a moment "the irrevocable counsel of God," and indulged in "a passing wish" inconsistent with that counsel: but that "the next instant" better thoughts "*triumphed* in Him." That the writer of this horrible passage should dare to arraign such documents as Honorius's Letters, is among the many marvels of disloyal and rebellious Catholicism.

And lastly, on our own side there is one point of doctrine which we must mention, to which, if we may judge by one of Mr. Renouf's notes (p. 18), he is a total stranger: we mean the doctrine, that God the Son wrought His miraculous works through the mediation of His sacred humanity. We know of no theologian who has expressed this doctrine more clearly and fully than Suarez (de Incarn., disp. xxxi.), and we will here give a very brief outline of what he says. It is *of faith*, he affirms (sec. 2), that Christ wrought true miracles through His humanity; according to His own declaration, that the *Son of Man* hath power on earth of forgiving sins": and from this, adds Suarez, it necessarily follows, that a supernatural power for this purpose was given to the sacred humanity. This power, moreover, resides in the sacred humanity "*per modum habitûs*," and was given from the very moment of the Incarnation. It is further the more probable view, in Suarez's estimation, that every grace which God has ever given to man, from the moment of the Incarnation, He has given through the sacred humanity as through His instrument. "The Man Christ," adds Suarez (sec. 3.), "by the actions of His humanity, has worked miracles, and justified souls in giving grace and the like, not only by moral, but also by *real and physical* operation (*modo*)."^{*} Still this sacred humanity "was not the chief proximate principle in such acts, but only the organ and instrument of the Word." It is extraordinary how Mr. Renouf has bungled in his note to page 18, from ignorance apparently of this touching doctrine.

This leads us to one particular point of contrast between Monothelism and Orthodoxy, which deserves careful attention. S. Leo had laid down in his Letter to S. Flavian, that "each of Christ's natures performs its proper work *with communication of the other*"; and more distinctly in another Letter, quoted by Petavius (de Incarn., l. 8, c. xi. n. 7), that "neither were divine things done by Him without His co-operation as man, nor human things without His co-operation as God."^{*} This distinction between the divine and

^{*} "Ut nec sine Homine divina, nec sine Deo agerentur humana." So the Sixth Council: "Dum cum alterius communione utraque natura indivise et inconfuse propria vellet atque operaretur."

human acts of God Incarnate, bears a most important part in the Monothelite controversy : by His divine acts being understood, His various performances of things miraculous ; and by His human acts, all the rest. S. Leo had laid down, as we have seen, that the two natures co-operated with each other in *both* classes of action ; but, according to Catholic theology, the *mode* of co-operation was essentially different. Of His divine acts, His divine will was the proximate principle, and His human nature served only as its organ or instrument ; but of His human acts, His human will was the proximate principle, and His divine will flowed into them in the way of illumination and guidance. (See Petavius de Incarn., l. 8, c. 13, n. 5 ; also c. 12, n. 9.)* On the other hand it was the very essence of Monothelism, to deny all distinction whatever between His mode of performing divine and human acts respectively ; for Monothelites ascribed to Him no other activity except the divine. See Theodore, Cyrus, and Macarius, quoted by Petavius de Incarn., l. 1, c. xx. nn. 2, 3, 4.

From these doctrinal preliminaries, we proceed to an examination of Honorius's Letters. And what we profess to establish is this : that if he is supposed to possess the most ordinary clear-headedness and consecutiveness, these Letters conclusively prove him to have held the doctrine afterwards defined against Monothelism. If some imaginary opponent chooses to say, "Oh ! but Honorius was a Monothelite, and all Monothelites were bad reasoners,"—such an objection evidently assumes the one question at issue ; viz. Honorius's Monothelism. On the other hand, when Mr. Renouf maintains that some argument, which he ascribes to Honorius, cannot possibly be a contemptible argument, because *Monothelites* at all events used to urge it (see e.g. page 22, note),—we have every right to complain of such reasoning. We have every right to complain that he should depy without any attempt at proof—what almost all Catholic writers strenuously maintain—the deplorable argumentative imbecility, which characterized every branch of Eutychianism.† What we allege is, that Honorius's Letters, interpreted by the recognised laws of logic and language, present one, and one only, consistent, consecutive, intelligible sense ; and that, taken in that sense, they "demonstrate him to have held the orthodox dogma as clearly and explicitly as it was held by S. Sophronius, S. Maximus, S. Martin I., S. Agatho, or S. Leo II." These words are from our article of

* It should be explained however, that when Christ performed miracles on earth by means of bodily acts—as e.g. when He cured the blind by His touch—the proximate principle of such bodily movement was of course His human will.

† With special reference to Monothelites, Petavius says that "he who looks for consistency of reason and judgment in their dogmata, requires from them what the nature of things does not admit."—De Incarn., l. 8, c. iv. n. 7.

January, 1869, p. 188; and we proceeded (pp. 188-198) to argue in defence of our proposition. We are now to answer those objections against our argument, which Mr. Renouf has attempted to adduce.

We will begin with that sentence of the first Letter, on which Mr. Renouf, in company with Honorius's other opponents, lays his principal stress. "We profess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ: because plainly our *nature* was assumed by the Godhead, not the *sin* in it; that is, our nature as it was created before sin existed, not that which was corrupted after the transgression." On this sentence we commented as follows:—

"The question to be here asked is most simple, and admits but of one possible reply. Is Honorius speaking in these words of Christ's divine or human will? Mr. Renouf makes the astounding remark that 'the context of this passage' proves its reference to the *divine* will. Can he be in his senses? Does he think, or did Honorius think, that Adam before the Fall was a plant? a vegetable? at the utmost a brute? Was not Adam created in possession of a *will*? That which he was happy in *not* possessing, was a second will at variance with the first. Now Honorius's distinct argument is this:—'Since Christ assumed that human nature which existed before the Fall, He has only one will, and not two.' Yet Mr. Renouf will have it, and Dr. Döllinger will have it, that the will of which the Pontiff speaks is the divine. When should we have heard the last of it, if some unlucky Ultramontane had talked such nonsense?"

To this Mr. Renouf replies (p. 19, note) that, according to Honorius, "the will is to be attributed" to the *person* and not to the *nature* (p. 20); that Honorius's argument is "there is but one Person in Christ, therefore there is but one will." We can only rejoin, that Mr. Renouf, in clearing himself from one "blunder," has fallen into another still more deplorable. The reason assigned by Honorius for Christ having only one will, is His having assumed nature innocent and not nature corrupted. Most indubitably therefore it is Honorius's doctrine, that if (per possibile aut impossibile) God the Son had assumed human nature as it existed *after the Fall*, there *would* have been two wills in Christ. But, according to Mr. Renouf, Honorius thought that the number of *wills* necessarily coincides with the number of *persons*. According to Mr. Renouf therefore, Honorius thought that, if God the Son had assumed man's fallen nature, He would thereby have become Two Persons! On this notable argument we need spend no more words.

Mr. Renouf further objects (pp. 19, 20), that the particle "unde," with which Honorius's sentence begins, proves his argument to be, that "there is but one Person in Christ, therefore

but one will." We have just shown, on the contrary, that this cannot by possibility be Honorius's meaning. As to the particle "unde," we explained in January, 1869 (p. 192), how we understand it, and Mr. Renouf has not attempted any reply to our explanation.

Nothing then can be more certain, than that the "one will" mentioned by Honorius is one *human*, as contrasted with two human and contrary wills. We sympathize heartily with F. Bottalla on this point. "Every time we read these words we are amazed, that men who possess an extended and scientific knowledge of literature have been able to disguise from themselves the natural and obvious purport of these words" (p. 54).

Mr. Renouf's next objection bears on Honorius's statement, concerning such well-known expressions as "Non quod volo, sed quod Tu vis," and the like. These, says Honorius, "non sunt diversæ voluntatis, sed dispensationis (οἰκονοµίας) humanitatis assumptæ." Mr. Renouf, in his former pamphlet, said that in this passage Honorius accounts such words of our Blessed Lord as "economical expressions used for our sakes." What does this mean? we asked. "Does Mr. Renouf think that Honorius considered such expressions as used by Christ for the sake of producing on us a *true* or a *false* impression? If Mr. Renouf gives the former answer, he admits at once the perfect orthodoxy of Honorius": for he admits thereby that Honorius did ascribe to Christ a human will. But if Mr. Renouf gives the latter answer, "what is the view which he ascribes to the Pope? This, that God the Son used language which in every sense was totally mendacious, for the sake of deceiving His creatures into the acceptance of false doctrine" (p. 192). Mr. Renouf now rejoins (p. 22, note) that "the logic of this is not very apparent": but we think that it must be very apparent indeed to every careful reader except himself. We must really press for an answer to our extremely intelligible question, unless our opponent will admit himself to have been grossly in the wrong. Honorius's reference to the two contrary wills—even if that sentence stood alone—would afford (we maintain) demonstrative evidence, that he so simply and firmly held Duothelistic doctrine, as not even to suspect the existence of any other.*

We said in a note, quite incidentally (p. 195), that, as a mere matter of language, the word "διαφόρου" must signify "at variance," and not merely "different in entity." Mr. Renouf replies (p. 21, note) that we are quite mistaken. Well, if we are,

* A very similar statement to this of Honorius is quoted by Petavius (de Incarn., l. 9, c. ix. n. 6) from S. Epiphanius. Christ spoke, says that Father, *economically*, yet not *feigningly* but *truly*; that He might exhibit the real existence of His human nature.

we are mistaken in very good company. Schleusner gives only the following senses of the word "διάφορος": (1) "discrepans"; (2) "omne quo res dignoscitur, quod dissimilem reddit"; (3) "excellens." Liddell and Scott speak altogether similarly; and we have not thought it worth while to consult other lexicographers. We still think that, as a matter of language, "διαφόρου θελήματος" must mean "a will differently affected"; nor can we doubt that Honorius's original expression was that which now stands in the Latin, "diversæ voluntatis." But the thing is quite immaterial.

Mr. Renouf's only remaining objection concerns a sentence in the earlier part of the Pope's first Letter, which we quoted as decisive of his orthodoxy. Christ, says Honorius, "operated divine things through the mediation of His humanity," and "operated human things ineffably and singularly in His assumed nature (carne)." Mr. Renouf (p. 18, note) considers that our argument evinces our total ignorance of the Monothelite tenets; and *we* in return consider that his objection evinces his total ignorance of an important Catholic dogma. Mr. Renouf declares *ex cathedra* (p. 91) that Honorius's sentence "might have been written by Theodore of Pharan," one of the Monothelite heresiarchs. Suarez on the contrary, as we have shown, considers it not only to be no Monothelistic error but to be an integral part of the Catholic Faith, that Christ wrought His divine acts through the mediation of His sacred humanity. On the other hand, no view was a more essential characteristic of the Monothelites, than their denial of all difference between Christ's mode of performing His divine and human acts respectively. On this most critical issue, Honorius pronounces orthodoxy with the greatest explicitness. It is of Christ's *divine* acts alone, that Honorius declares Him to have wrought them "*mediâ* humanitate." Of His human acts, the Pope declares that Christ "wrought them ineffably and singularly *in His assumed nature*."

As to the Pope's second Letter, many critics are quite satisfied with it, even among those who regard his first as more or less unorthodox in tendency. In this Letter he declares that Christ possesses "two natures, *energizing* and *principles of action* (*ἐνεργουῦσας καὶ πρακτικὰς*). And the inference which would be drawn by any one less prejudiced than Mr. Renouf would be, that the Pope was prevented indeed by a certain false pride (for which we cannot of course make any kind of defence) from seeing the very disastrous mistake he had made in discountenancing the phrase "two energies"; but that he was nevertheless induced, by what he had heard from S. Sophronius's envoys, to explain his doctrine even more unambiguously than he had explained it in his former Letter.

The various questions which concern Sergius are so very far less important, that we will but most briefly touch them.

1. It is quite certain, whatever Mr. Renouf may think (pp. 26, 27), that Sergius did practise a certain studied reticence towards the Pope: for he represented S. Sophronius and himself as absolutely agreed on all points of dogma.

Mr. Renouf urges indeed, as an objection to this view, that Sergius did not speak more clearly even in the "Ecthesis" than in his letter to the Pope. But the "Ecthesis" was intended as a kind of concordat between Monothelism and Orthodoxy, not as an emphatic expression of the heretical doctrine. If you would have the latter, look at the expressions brought together by Petavius from Monothelite heresiarchs: de Incarn., l. 1, c. xx. nn. 2, 3, 4.

2. As to what Mr. Renouf (p. 25, note) considers "the most indubitably Monothelistic part" of Sergius's whole letter,—the Latin translation adds the word "contrarias"; which the Greek also gives as an alternative reading, and which entirely removes all *prima facie* appearance of Monothelism. Until Mr. Renouf gives reason to the contrary, we shall continue to consider this the true reading. We so consider it, both because it is far more suitable to the context; and also because we think it improbable that the most Monothelistic part of Sergius's letter should be absent from the "Ecthesis," which was so largely *founded* on that letter.

3. In January, 1869 (p. 190, note), we printed the two sentences of Sergius's letter which impressed us as "most indubitably Monothelistic." Mr. Renouf points out, that the latter of these was part of a quotation, made by the heretical patriarch from S. Gregory Nyssen. See the note at p. 250 of our last number. And though the sentence which we quoted *first* so governs and interprets this latter sentence as to fix it (in Sergius's context) to a Monothelistic sense, yet certainly here was one reason the more for Honorius failing to see Sergius's real drift.

4. Mr. Renouf considers (p. 25) that a reply to one of our arguments is found in the circumstance, that Sergius spoke indeed of two *contrary* wills, but not of two *human* and contrary. Why, our whole argument would remain exactly what it is, if the word "human" be omitted from the only two sentences in which it occurs. Our precise meaning however would have been made clearer, if in line 16 we had added, after the word "Sergius," the words "as understood by Honorius." We had said just before, that the Pope "thoroughly coincided with what *he understood to be* Sergius's mind."

Now let the precise point be borne in mind, for which Sergius's letter is cited in the controversy. It will soon be seen how very

far we are from wishing in any way to extenuate Honorius's grievously culpable neglect. But the question *here* to be asked is simply this,—Did Sergius express Monothelite tenets so distinctly, that the Pope's acquiescence in his letter and in his policy is a proof of Honorius being *infected* with those tenets? As to the indubitably Monothelistic passages in Sergius, neither of the two was reproduced by Honorius in his reply, either expressly or equivalently; one of the two, moreover, having been quoted by Sergius (however perversely) from a most orthodox Father. Nay, Mr. Renouf is even forward in urging (p. 14) that the phrase "one energy" "had the sanction of great Catholic authorities"; and he quotes textually (p. 34, note) one most strong expression of the kind from S. Cyril of Alexandria. How then can Honorius's Monothelism be inferred from the mere fact of his not *anathematizing* the phrase "one energy,"—unless S. Gregory Nyssen and S. Cyril are thereby proved Monothelites, who actually *adopted* it? Nor has Mr. Renouf—and let this be carefully observed—made any attempt whatever to paraphrase Honorius's Letter *as a whole* in an unorthodox sense.

In truth, his view of Honorius's doctrine violates historical probability, in a degree which cannot be exaggerated. Nothing can be more intelligible than the account commonly given by Catholic historians as to the origin of Monothelism. The Eutychian doctrine prevailed very extensively in the East. Various persons accordingly, who were infected with that doctrine but were unwilling for various reasons to break with the Church, took up a ground essentially Eutychian, but which was as yet external to the Church's formal anathema. But how can any one suppose that *Honorius* caught the infection? Neither Eastern sojourns nor Eastern intimacies had borne any part in his history. He had been exclusively nurtured among Western traditions; and Western traditions, as the event showed, were intensely Duothelistic. On the other hand it has never, we suppose, been so much as alleged, that he was *converted* by Sergius's letter: that letter did but give him occasion of expressing the doctrine which he had always held. That he should have utterly failed in imagining even the existence of so unchristian a doctrine as the Monothelite, is among the most probable of suppositions; that he should *himself* have been a Monothelite, is among the most unhistorical theories ever invented. And the whole of this argument applies equally to the Abbot John, whom Mr. Renouf thinks the probable author of the Letters which were issued in his own name by Pope Honorius.

Here however an objection has been raised against our whole argument, founded on our very statement: for it has been urged, that if the Western tradition was thus intensely Duothelistic, Honorius could not have failed to see through Sergius's craft.

But this objection is based on a complete misconception of our meaning. We do not say that the Western tradition at that time was "explicitly," but that it was "intensely" Duothelistic; and these two expressions mean something very different. When we say, as we do, that the Roman tradition was not "explicitly" Duothelistic before Monothelism arose,—we mean that the Westerns were not acquainted with the terminology introduced by that controversy, nor had otherwise given their mind to consider the question. When on the contrary we say that the Western tradition was from the first "intensely" Duothelistic, we mean that, so soon as they came to *apprehend* the new doctrine, they saw most vividly and intensely its fundamental contradictoriness to the Faith which they had learned from infancy. In no state of mind would Honorius be so likely as in this, to make the very mistake which we ascribe to him. The intensity and the non-explicitness of his Duothelism would combine to prevent him from even imagining the existence of such a heresy as Sergius's. Whereas on the other hand if, as Mr. Renouf thinks, he did understand that heresy, he must have thereby been aware how fundamentally it contradicted the doctrine prevalent in his own Church. On Mr. Renouf's supposition therefore,—viz. that he regarded Monothelism as the Apostolic dogma,—it is quite incredible that he should not have earnestly laboured to put down Duothelism in the West.

There is another circumstance, which Mr. Renouf has failed to observe; but which is very manifest from Honorius's second Letter, and which alone would be decisive. *After the Pontiff had received the full explanation given him by S. Sophronius's envoys, he still considered that there was no dogmatic difference between the two patriarchs.* Evidently therefore he interpreted Sergius's views by S. Sophronius's, and not the reverse.

We must conclude however our treatment of Mr. Renouf's first thesis, by frankly admitting that Honorius did make one serious doctrinal mistake; for he considered the phrase "two energies" an inappropriate expression of Catholic dogma. In July, 1868 (p. 225), we said we were "not very clear" on this point; but on further consideration, we cannot but account it certain, that Honorius's view on this verbal question differed from that which was afterwards infallibly determined. It need hardly however be pointed out, (1) that in *his* time the Church had not spoken on that particular question; and (2) that the gulf is most wide, between heresy in *dogma* and mistake in mere dogmatic *expression*.

Still, argues Mr. Renouf,—and this is his second thesis,—even if Honorius could be acquitted of heresy on the internal evidence of his Letters, this will avail nothing: for he has been infallibly condemned as heretical. But in order to establish this thesis,

Mr. Renouf has resorted to a most singular paralogism. We repelled his assault in July, 1868, by maintaining a certain doctrine concerning the "subject" of infallibility: but this doctrine, replies our opponent (p. 55), is a "notion" which "can only be maintained by Ultramontanes of a very peculiar school." How can *that* fact possibly signify? His whole argument is "ad hominem," and otherwise would be simply worthless. Were he to prove by mathematical demonstration that, according to *his* ecclesiastical theory, Honorius has been infallibly condemned of heresy, such a conclusion need not show more—to our mind it most certainly *would* not show more—than that Mr. Renouf's ecclesiastical theory is totally mistaken. He alleges Honorius's heresy, as an argument for the falsehood of Ultramontaniam; and then he assumes the falsehood of Ultramontaniam, as an argument for Honorius's heresy. Never was there a more transparent (we had almost said more childish) fallacy. What he had to prove—if his argument were to be worth more than the paper on which it is written—is, that Ultramontanes, on *their* ecclesiastical theory, are obliged to account Honorius a heretic. Now, Ultramontanes consider that the voice of infallibility is never heard, except when the Pope speaks *ex cathedrâ*: for even the definitions of a Council, according to Ultramontanes, are not infallible, except so far as the Pope *ex cathedrâ* confirms them. What Mr. Renouf has to prove then, if he would advance his cause one single step, is that some Pope has *ex cathedrâ* condemned Honorius's doctrine as heretical.

On the whole this will perhaps be the most convenient place for considering a statement of Mr. Renouf's, which is at once the most fundamental, and the most paradoxical, in his whole pamphlet: and to which, nevertheless, he does not devote more than a quarter of a page out of his hundred pages. When Ultramontanes say that a Pope is not infallible except when speaking *ex cathedrâ*, nothing can be more definite than the sense in which they use this phrase: they mean, that a Pope is not infallible unless where he purports to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine. To this definition Mr. Renouf objects in effect (p. 77, note), that no Pope in the early ages ever did purport to do this; * and consequently, that modern Ultramontanes must in consistency deny infallibility to have existed *at all*, until long after the days of Honorius and S. Leo II. When Janus made a similar assertion, we did not think it worth while to argue at length on a matter so undeniable: see our last number, p. 213. But Mr. Renouf having now endorsed the statement, we must add a few more words to what we said in January. We will beg Mr. Renouf's attention,

* See the second note to p. 252 of our last number.

therefore, to the following facts. They all belong to a period preceding the reign of Honorius ; and throughout we place in italics those words to which we desire particular attention.

Pope S. Hormisdas required from the repentant Acacians a certain profession, as a condition of communion. It was subscribed at the time by all the Eastern bishops, and afterwards by all the Fathers of the Eighth Council. It begins with stating that "to preserve the rule of right faith is the commencement of salvation"; and that, in accordance with Christ's "Tu es Petrus," "religion has ever been preserved without defilement in the Apostolic See." "Wherefore," it presently continues, "we *receive and approve all the Letters of Pope Leo* concerning the Christian religion"; . . . "following in all things the Apostolic See, and *preaching all her Constitutions.*"

At a later period, Pope Vigilius addressed a Letter to the Greek Emperor. In this Letter, after having recited various Letters of his predecessors, S. Leo, S. Hormisdas, S. Agapetus, which had never been placed before any Œcumenical Council, the Pope thus proceeds :—

With regard then to those things which have been defined concerning the Faith by the Fathers of the *four holy Synods*, and by the before-mentioned *Letters of Pope Leo of happy memory*, and the *Constitutions of our venerable predecessors*—condemning, by the authority of the Apostolic See, those who do not follow these in every particular (*per omnia non sequentes*), and who oppose their doctrines,—we *anathematize* those who shall have attempted either perversely to dispute or *faithlessly to doubt* concerning the exposition or rectitude of that Faith ; and we sever from the unity of the Catholic Faith persons who think against those things concerning the Faith which are contained in the *most holy Synods* of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and in the above-mentioned *Letters of our predecessor Leo of happy memory*, or all those things which his authority sanctioned (*lib. i. c. 19, art. 2*).

Nor was this only Vigilius's *claim*: the claim was *admitted*. Orsi (*de Irreformabili, &c.*, l. i. c. 19, art. 2) draws attention to one particular part of Vigilius's "Constitutum." In this the Pontiff quotes a letter, addressed to him by the Patriarch of Constantinople and by several Eastern bishops, promising that they would in all things follow the Letters of S. Leo and the *Constitutions of the Holy See*, whether *as regards faith* or as regards the authority (*firmitate*) of the four preceding Councils. And the Emperor also held the same doctrine: for, as Orsi proceeds to point out, another passage from Vigilius's "Constitutum" proves this. Vigilius speaks with approbation of Justinian's having influenced the bishops to put forth "professions" of faith, whereby they "were shown to *adhere to the*

definitions and judgments of the holy Fathers, and of the four venerable Councils, and of the bishops of the Apostolic See."* But Mr. Renouf will not deny—see e. g. his language in p. 54—that every Catholic at that period regarded the definitions of those Councils as irreformable and (in modern language) infallible: such therefore, and no less, was the authority which Vigilius claimed, as due to those "definitions and judgments of bishops of the Apostolic See" to which he refers.

No historical fact then can well be more certain, than that, by Vigilius's time at all events, it was a recognized and customary habit for Pontiffs to put forth certain "definitions," "judgments," "constitutions," concerning the Faith, which claimed from all Catholics absolute and unreserved interior assent. It is perfectly clear that many such then existed; and that an indefinite number were expected for the future.† An early instance of such dogmatic Letters was Pope S. Celestine's addressed to the Third Council. He had told his Legates that they were to "*judge* on the opinions of the bishops, not to enter into *dispute* with them"; and the bishops, in anathematizing Nestorius, declared that they had been "*compelled* thereto (*ἀναγκάως κατεπευχθέντες*) by the sacred canons and by the *Letter* of their most holy father and fellow-minister, Celestine." The Monothelite controversy itself again presents a very remarkable specimen of such a Letter, in S. Agatho's address to the Sixth Council. The argument derivable from this Letter is admirably drawn out by F. Bottalla, from p. 85 to p. 90. See also Orsi's important reasoning on the same Letter: l. 1, c. xxiii n. 3.

We consider then, that we have sufficiently established on this subject all which is necessary for our controversy with Mr. Renouf: and we have no space for more. Suffice it further to say that, according to that view of Christian doctrine which we earnestly maintain, each Pope from the first was invested by God with full power of issuing such Acts, whenever he might think their issue desirable; and that by divine promise their teaching is always infallibly true. On the other hand it need hardly be added, that no *other* Pontifical Acts are regarded by an Ultramontane as

* By the "holy Fathers" are here meant the bishops assembled in Ecumenical Council: as is made clear by a letter presently quoted by Orsi from Justinian, in which he says that he "follows the Constitutions of the holy Fathers, i. e. the 318 assembled at Nicæa."

† "Tota mea argumentatio fundatur in duobus factis historicis, quæ proculdubio *extra omnem controversiam posita sunt*. . . . Primum factum. Constat ex historiâ ecclesiasticâ usque ab antiquissimâ ætate quod Romani Pontifices sæpius . . . libellos et professiones fidei *a singulis episcopis subscribendas indixerunt*, vel decreta et constitutiones de Fide ediderunt *per universam Ecclesiam cum præcepto obediendi* ad omnes episcopos directo, &c." —Muzzarelli, de Auctoritate Summi Pontificis, c. xii. sec. 4.

strictly infallible, except those which thus purport to claim the irreformable interior assent of all Christians.

The brief discussion which we have just concluded bears far less intimately on Mr. Renouf's second thesis than on his third ; but it is by no means without importance, even as regards the former. We are next therefore to inquire who are those Popes, concerning whom it can possibly be alleged that they have ex cathedrâ condemned Honorius for professing heresy. They are these : S. Leo II., in confirming the Sixth Council ; Adrian I., in confirming the Seventh ; and Adrian II., in confirming the Eighth. By far the most important question however concerns the first of the three ; and it is before all things necessary to understand the state of the case, as it came before S. Leo II.

After our previous argument, we shall here assume that Honorius was personally free from all taint of the Monothelite heresy, and that he did not even dream of its existence. Yet it is difficult to see how a Pope could have failed much more grievously than he, in his duty of guarding the Faith. Let us suppose that when Eutyches first broached his heresy, Pope S. Leo had earnestly exhorted the Easterns to abstain from saying that Christ is either " of " or " in " two natures, and had even denounced the question as a mischievous subtlety. Honorius's offence was as great as would have been S. Leo's in this imaginary case. Most certainly indeed he did not teach *ex cathedrâ* that the question of one or " two energies " is a pernicious subtlety ; this we shall establish irrefragably, in answering Mr. Renouf's third thesis : but it is certain nevertheless, that he strongly enforced, and energetically acted on, this fatal opinion. In some respects indeed, we think more unfavourably of his conduct than does Mr. Renouf ; because we judge Monothelism itself with so much greater severity. A certain heresy arose, which subverted Christianity from its very foundation.* S. Sophronius, who had the singular merit of being its earliest noteworthy opponent, saw clearly its frightful character ; and saw also, that the one hope of opposing it was the explicit advocacy of Christ's two energies. Sergius, Cyrus, and the rest, with the detestable craftiness characteristic of heresy, shrank from openly denying the two energies of Christ. They took refuge in the pitiable device, that this phrase was a mere verbal subtlety ; and that to insist on it would on the one hand drive thousands out of the Church, while on the other hand it would be of no service to revealed dogma. On this vital issue, the Catholic and the heretical champion appealed to the Holy See ; and the occupant of that See—beyond all doubt most unwittingly—threw for the moment its

* See this conclusion advocated in our number for January, 1869, pp. 186-7. See also F. Bottalla's very able remarks, pp. 1-16.

whole weight into the heretical scale.* Sergius asked him for no more than a disciplinary judgment, and he pronounced that very judgment which Sergius desired. Instead of publishing, as circumstances imperatively required, an *ex cathedrâ* definition in favour of S. Sophronius, he sided entirely with the heretic on that very question which the heretic submitted to him. We have already argued that, so far from being personally tainted with Monothelism, he did not even dream of its existence; and had he been merely a private individual, it would have been an indefinitely less grievous offence not to *see through* the heresy, than personally to embrace it. But since he was the appointed guardian of the Faith, it is difficult to see how his course would have been much more culpable, even had he lapsed unawares into heresy himself. We speak throughout exclusively of *actions*, without presuming to conjecture *motives*. But it is the simple truth, that Christ placed the Faith in his charge, and that he was false to the trust. This is the conduct which S. Leo II. held up, by an anathema, to the reprobation of all subsequent ages.†

Here, however, a very obvious question will at once be asked. If we admit that Honorius committed almost as grievous a sin against the Faith as though he had himself fallen into Monothelism, why should we trouble ourselves to oppose Mr. Renouf's first thesis? But the answer is as obvious as the question. Ultramontanes consider the dogma of Pontifical infallibility to be the ecclesiastical foundation (if we may so express ourselves) of all certainty in believing; and they consider therefore, that no trouble can be too great in multiplying legitimate defences of that dogma. This in fact is the more necessary, because Gallican controversialists are so incredibly uncandid. However irrefragable therefore may be the proof that Honorius did not speak *ex cathedrâ*, it is nevertheless safer to dwell also on the most certain fact, that his Letters contain in themselves no taint of heresy. Then there is a second reason, subordinate indeed but far from unimportant. A pious opinion or augury is constantly taking deeper root in the Church, that God will never permit a Pope to lapse

* Our precise meaning in this phrase shall be explained at the end of our article.

† We are bound to say, on reflection, that in portions of our article in January, 1869, we did not represent Honorius's conduct in colours sufficiently dark. We have throughout however admitted—we say this because of Mr. Renouf's passing remark in p. 31—that S. Agatho and S. Leo II. differed from each other in their appreciation of Honorius's conduct; and we have added that it was the later Pope who spoke on the subject *ex cathedrâ*. We have suggested that possibly the human cause of this change in the Roman view may have been information received from the Roman legates who were present at the Sixth Council.

even personally into formal heresy; and it is of some moment therefore to show, that *Honorius* at all events was no exception to this rule. And further, thirdly, it is absolutely necessary to dwell on the indefectible purity of Roman tradition: see p. 197 of our last number. Whereas therefore Honorius lived in the full light of that tradition, devoted Catholics are desirous of showing, that his Letters afford no presumptive evidence against the indefectibleness of that purity. We shall dwell at greater length on this very important consideration, towards the end of our article.

But none of these reasons would weigh with S. Leo II. Not the first: because it was impossible for him to anticipate the future unfairness of Gallican controversialists. It was obvious on the surface, as we shall presently urge, that Honorius's Letters were not described by Pope or Council as "judgments," or "definitions," or "constitutions" of the Holy See; nor would it even occur to S. Leo that any one could imagine Honorius to have been condemned for defining untruly. Nor again would the second reason, above mentioned, weigh with S. Leo; because the pious opinion or augury in question did not then exist. As Mr. Renouf points out (p. 65), Pope Adrian II., long after S. Leo II., speaks as a matter of course of the possibility that a Pope may be personally heretical: and his words (as we mentioned in July, 1868) make it probable that S. Agatho had specially instructed his legates, to permit the Easterns to judge Honorius on this very charge. Indeed, since no one maintains that God has given any *promise* of preserving Popes from heresy, the pious opinion which we mention would not naturally occur to the mind of Catholics, until many centuries of experience had given it probability. Then lastly, the *third* reason above mentioned would not occur to S. Leo: because no one fact was more conspicuously manifest at that very moment and during the whole history of Monothelism, than the indefectible purity of Roman dogmatic tradition.

On the other hand what S. Leo II. did earnestly desire, was to foster in Catholics an execration of Monothelism and of all acts and words which had in any way promoted it. It sufficed then, that once for all he authentically explained the manner in which Honorius *had* promoted it; and there was really no reason for his taking particular pains to disabuse people of any mistaken notion they might entertain, on the precise character of his predecessor's offence. So long as Catholics duly detested both the heresy itself and the conduct of its promoters, his purpose was fully answered.

These preliminaries having been dispatched, we approach Mr. Renouf's argument for his second thesis. And never surely was

there a stranger paradox than he is obliged to assume, in order to give this argument even a colourable pretext. There are of course no *degrees* in infallibility : and he is obliged therefore to maintain the extraordinary proposition, that the *Acts* of a Council are of precisely equal authority with its *Definition*. Let us compare the two in this particular instance. The Definition is called "the Definition"; and is signed by every one of the bishops present, with the words "*definiens subscripsi*": in both these particulars it differs from the Acts. The critical question however to an Ultramontane is of course precisely this: which are those decisions *confirmed by the Pope*. On this head there is not so much as the possibility of a doubt. F. Bottalla states most clearly the undeniable facts of the case. We italicize a few of his words.

"The fathers of the Sixth Synod, at the end of the eighteenth session, asked the Emperor to send to all the patriarchal sees an authentic copy of the *definition of faith*, signed by the Council. Pope Leo II. *confirmed* nothing but the *definition* of faith; although he *received* all the acts of the Synod, together with the imperial edict. We have several letters of this Pope in which he either authoritatively confirms the Sixth Council, or communicates to the bishops his adhesion to it. In all and each of them he *pointedly limits his confirmation and approval to the dogmatic Definition*. In his official Letter to the Emperor, he declares only that he confirms *the definition of the right faith*. In his Letter to the bishops of Spain he tells them that he forwards to them the Definition of faith sanctioned in the Sixth Synod, the prosphonic address to the Emperor, and his edict; he promises that he will send the whole of the conciliar Acts; but *he requires their signatures to no more than the Definition of faith*. He says the same in his letter to Simplicius, and in that addressed to King Ervigius. So that no doubt whatever can remain with regard to his intention being really what he expresses. Again, in what manner did he sanction the Definition of faith, and in what sense did he anathematize Honorius? 'Since the holy, universal, and great Sixth Synod,' he says, . . . 'has followed in everything the apostolic doctrine of the most eminent fathers, and since it preached the same *Definition of the right faith* which the Apostolic See of the holy Apostle Peter received with veneration, therefore we, and through our exercise of our office this venerable Apostolic See, gives full consent to *the things contained in the Definition of faith*; and confirms them with the authority of the blessed Peter, that, being placed on the solid rock of Christ himself, it may be supplied by the Lord with strength.'"

What Pontifical approval can Mr. Renouf cite for the *Acts*, which approaches this ever so distantly? He points out that S. Leo II. widely circulated the Emperor's Edict, the Acts and the

Acclamations, without hinting the least disagreement from the sense of the Council (pp. 57-59). This indubitably shows that, in his judgment, the general drift and contents of Edict, Acts, and Acclamations was admirable; and that they contained nothing, from which it was desirable that he should explicitly state any disagreement. But surely Mr. Renouf will not himself allege—for he has not taken leave of his senses—that this is tantamount to imposing on all Catholics an obligation of receiving the whole with irreformable interior assent. On the contrary, as to the *Definition*, S. Leo placed it “on the solid rock of Christ Himself”; and all the bishops had been required to subscribe it, in token of unreserved interior acceptance. The Edict, Acts, and Acclamations were most edifying ecclesiastical documents, heartily recommended to the careful and respectful study of the faithful; but it was the *Definition* which was to be received, as the very voice of Peter living in his successors.

Mr. Renouf indeed argues (p. 55) from the example of earlier Councils; but his argument recoils on himself with fatal effect. The whole question turns on the issue, whether the Conciliar decrees mentioned were the whole body of Conciliar *Acts*, or only the Conciliar *Definitions*. Now not one syllable has he alleged in favour of the *former* alternative, whereas he has produced one (p. 58) which pronounces incontestably in favour of the *latter*. In his confirmation of the Sixth Council, S. Leo II. declares that he “has received and firmly proclaims” the five preceding; and adds that he “receives with like veneration the Sixth.” With *what* veneration? He had said only the sentence before: “We consent,” he had said, “to those things which have been *defined* by it.”

So Natalis Alexander speaks concerning the Fourth Council. He is considering the question of Ibas's letter having been condemned by the *Definition* of the Fifth Council, after having been (as some think) absolved in the *Acts* of the Fourth. He denies indeed that the fact was so; but he adds the following remark: “Although [this letter] could be demonstrated to have been *approved by the Council of Chalcedon*, and all the bishops had subscribed to it, nevertheless it was rightly re-examined and condemned by the Fifth Council”; for S. Leo I., he adds, “limited (constrinxit) the authority of the Chalcedonian Council to its *Definition of faith*.” (Sæculum Sextum, Dissert. 4, obj. 5, resp. 3.)

Surely indeed common sense speaks on the subject, with a plainness from which there is no appeal. The infallibility of a Council means the infallibility of what it *defines*; and what it defines is simply, by the very force of terms, its *Definition*.*

* It has been suggested to us, that our remarks may possibly be understood as denying the infallibility of the Tridentine capitula. But no fact in history

So much then being understood, our next question is, in what sense S. Leo II. confirmed the Sixth Council's anathema of Honorius. Here are his words:—

In like manner we anathematize the inventors of the new error: Theodore, bishop of Pharan; Cyrus of Alexandria; Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, overthrowers rather than rulers of the Constantinopolitan Church: nay, and Honorius also; who did not labour to preserve in purity this Apostolic Church by the teaching of Apostolic tradition, but *permitted* the spotless to be polluted by profane betrayal: and likewise all who have shared in their error, &c. &c.

These words, clear in themselves, receive further illustration from the same Pontiff's language in addressing the Spanish bishops and king:—

Those who fought against the purity of Apostolic Doctrine and have died, have been punished by an eternal condemnation: that is, Theodore, Cyrus, &c. &c.; together with Honorius, who did not extinguish at its outset the flame of heretical dogma, as became his Apostolic authority, but *by neglecting* fostered it.

All the authors of heretical assertion were cast out from the Church's unity; Theodore, Cyrus, &c.: and with them, Honorius of Rome, who *consented* that that undefiled rule of Apostolic tradition should be defiled, which he received from his predecessors.

Now we must argue again, as we argued before, that such language is directly inconsistent with the supposition of S. Leo having regarded Honorius as a Monothelite. "Let us take a parallel case. A mutiny arises in some regiment, and the Colonel is accused before a Court Martial of being concerned in it. The Court pronounces, that Captains A and B, Lieutenants C, D, and E, &c. &c., were concerned in the mutiny; nay, and that the Colonel himself did not, as was his duty, detect it at its beginning and promptly put it down; but on the contrary, by his neglect fostered its growth, and permitted the loyalty of the regiment to be stained. No one of common sense would understand their verdict otherwise, than as condemning the Colonel indeed of very culpable neglect, but as acquitting him of all sympathy with the mutiny. Had Honorius been himself disposed to Monothelism, his *neglect*—instead of being a calamity—would have been the best thing for

is more certain than that these were promulgated as no less integral a portion of the Tridentine *Definitions* than the canons themselves. Dr. Murray has exhibited in full, following earlier theologians, the irrefragable arguments which establish this conclusion. We gave a summary of them in our number for October, 1867, p. 349, note.

the Church which under circumstances could happen " (Jan. 1869, p. 182).

Mr. Renouf's attempted reply to this is the best imaginable proof that no real reply is possible. "The Abbot John," he says (p. 62), "was the real author of Honorius's heretical Letters; and the real neglect of Honorius consists in allowing those Letters to be written in his name and subscribed with his hand." In other words Mr. Renouf alleges, that the distinction intended by S. Leo II. was between his predecessor's *Letters* and that predecessor's *personal belief*. But nothing could be easier to *express* than this distinction, if the Pontiff had intended it. According to Mr. Renouf indeed, the one thing which S. Leo II. *abstained* from saying, was the one thing which he *intended* to say. On the one hand he speaks of Honorius having "permitted," "consented," "neglected"; on the other hand, he speaks inclusively of Honorius (see our article for July, 1868, p. 223) as "preaching one will and one operation," and "shamelessly labouring to defend heretical doctrine." What would have been simpler than to say, that it was Honorius's *Letter* which defended heretical doctrine, and that he was *personally* nevertheless a stranger to heresy? Yet nowhere does S. Leo II. point at such a distinction ever so distantly.

Secondly it is most evident, on a close study of S. Leo's different expressions, that the fault with which he charged his predecessor was neglect of some duty specially incumbent on him as *occupant of the Apostolic See*. "He did not labour to preserve in purity *this Apostolic Church*"; he did not act "as became *his Apostolic authority*"; he failed towards "that undefiled rule of *Apostolic* tradition which *he received from his predecessors*." But Mr. Renouf's attempted interpretation entirely fails to meet this requirement; for it would be a grievous offence in *any* bishop, and not merely in a Pope, to issue letters officially, of vital dogmatic importance, without acquainting himself with their contents.

This brings us to a third objection. Mr. Renouf adopts his hypothesis, in order to explain S. Leo's statement that Honorius "by *neglecting* fostered" the heresy. But the conduct ascribed to him by Mr. Renouf is an offence of the most positive possible kind; a grievous offence of commission. You might as well say that *burglary* is a sin of omission, as that it is a sin of omission for a Pope to issue in his own name two Letters involving the very gravest dogmatic interests, without any examination of their contents. On the other hand if you adopt the ordinary view,—that Honorius wrote in most honest accordance with his convictions, and that his fault was the not taking due pains to *enlighten* those convictions,—you will naturally call his sin, as S. Leo II. called it, a sin of *neglect*.

Then, lastly, what single instance can Mr. Renouf allege from

all history, in which the Church took cognizance of a fact so purely private and personal as that ascribed by him to Honorius? When did the Church ever inquire, how far this or that bishop used the services of a secretary, and what part such secretary took in composing the episcopal letters?

There is one simple fact, which throws a flood of light on the point at issue. In Roman documents subsequent to the Sixth Council, Honorius is sometimes mentioned by himself, and sometimes in company with the Monothelite heresiarchs. In the former cases it is never once declared that he "preached," or "taught," or "held" the Monothelite heresy; but only that he "neglected," "permitted," "consented," "gave encouragement." This fact cannot possibly be accidental; and it is simply fatal to Mr. Renouf's theory. On the other hand, it is frequently said of Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, and the rest, *including* Honorius, that they "preached one will and one operation"; that they "disseminated heresy"; &c. &c.: and this is most intelligible from our point of view. At a certain period a certain detestable heresy arose, which laboured to expel from the Church her fundamental dogma of Christ's two wills and operations. In its first epoch, the method adopted by its originators was to deny that the phrase, "two energies," fitly expresses the revealed dogma. During Honorius's lifetime, this was the critical and the turning point: and on this point Honorius not only agreed with them, but officially declared that agreement; nay, he used every weapon which his position gave him except only an *ex cathedrâ* definition, to discourage the Church's true champion of orthodoxy. In a most true sense therefore he has been counted among them by more than one successive Pope, and justly included in their anathema.

What was the *meaning* of this anathema? Primarily, of course, that Pontiff pronounced it for the purpose of expressing due reprobation against Honorius's heresy-favouring conduct. Its immediately *practical* effect however, as F. Bottalla points out, was "that his name was to be erased from the diptychs and his likeness from the pictures in the churches." Mr. Renouf is indignant against such an inadequate view; and he proceeds to express what is, perhaps, the very oddest theological notion we ever happened to fall in with. "S. Leo II.," he says (p. 66, note), "understood the anathema in a different sense, when he told the Spanish bishops that Honorius and the other Monothelites '*æternâ damnatione mulctati sunt.*'" Such then is Mr. Renouf's view of the Church's power over a departed soul; and let no one henceforth suspect him of undervaluing the Church's prerogatives. Honorius, it seems, may have gone after death to purgatory and heaven: but when the Church pronounced her anathema, she thereby extruded him from bliss and condemned him to eternal

torment. Of course Mr. Renouf wrote off his note in a hurry, and we have no wish to pin him down. We will but say, that his remark is only saved from the charge of hideous blasphemy, by the (doubtless true) allegation of its entire unmeaningness.

As to the "otiose historical question," in what sense the *Eastern bishops* anathematized Honorius,—we have always thought more probable, that it was on the simple ground of his having professed Monothelism. Nor can we be much surprised at their mistake, which was implicitly corrected by S. Leo II. They assembled in a very grave crisis; and the words "two energies," "two wills," "one will," "Sergius," &c. &c., were (so to speak) ever ringing in their ears. Two Letters were produced, expressing most hearty doctrinal concurrence with one of the most prominent heresiarchs, and vehemently protesting that "two energies" is a most inappropriate expression of revealed dogma. So far from wondering that the bishops accounted these Letters heretical,—we think that S. Leo II. might possibly enough have made the very same mistake, had it not been for the Holy Ghost's promised assistance to all *ex cathedrâ* Acts of the Holy See.

Mr. Renouf's third thesis declares that Honorius taught Monothelism *ex cathedrâ*: but as it has now been seen that he never taught it at all, he very certainly never taught it *ex cathedrâ*. Still it is necessary to show that his Letters were *not* *ex cathedrâ*: because we have fully admitted that they contain one doctrinal mistake, in condemning the phrase "two energies" as an inappropriate expression of revealed dogma. It is in fact this third thesis on which our whole controversy with Mr. Renouf turns, so far as that controversy concerns the dogma of Pontifical infallibility. It is much to be observed therefore, that our disproof of this third thesis is so rigorous, as rather to resemble a mathematical demonstration than an ordinary historical argument.

Yet, curiously enough, Mr. Renouf and ourselves are thoroughly in accordance on the substance of this thesis, and differ only in our use of language. We have to maintain that Honorius never purported, in these Letters, to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine: and Mr. Renouf is entirely of the same mind. Mr. Renouf indeed further says that, up to Honorius's time and for centuries afterwards, no Pope *ever* issued *any* document which purported to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine (p. 77, and note): but to this amazing statement we have already sufficiently replied.

Let our position then be understood once for all. That doctrine of Papal infallibility for which we are zealous, is not that doctrine which Mr. Renouf thinks was once maintained by some Catholics, but that dogma which is upholden by every Ultramontane theo-

logian of the present day; the dogma upholden by Mgr. Dechamps and Archbishop Manning; the dogma, that every doctrine is infallibly true which any Pope teaches as obligatory to the whole Church.* And since Mr. Renouf admits that no false doctrine was so taught by *Honorius*, he admits that "the case of" that Pontiff presents no objection whatever, against that dogma of Pontifical infallibility which Ultramontanes now uphold.

However, as this dogma has other enemies besides Mr. Renouf, it will be better to show explicitly how extravagant is the supposition, that Honorius's Letters were issued *ex cathedrâ*. And firstly as to the Sixth Council. Not one syllable has ever been adduced, from anything said at this Council, which gives the faintest colour to any supposition that these Letters were considered *ex cathedrâ* Acts. They were not called "definitions," "judgments," "constitutions," nor even (when spoken of by themselves) "dogmatic Letters." (See our remark in July, 1868, p. 20.) In the thirteenth session the bishops in some sense drew attention to this fact; by speaking of "the *dogmatic* letter" written by Sergius, and the "*Letter*" written in reply by Honorius. Indeed, as F. Bottalla so powerfully argues, they sufficiently showed their belief in the infallibility of Pontifical Definitions, by their mode of receiving S. Agatho's Letter.

So much on any testimony derivable from the Sixth Council. We are now to show, from the content itself of Honorius's Letters, that he did not therein teach any doctrine whatever as obligatory on the interior assent of Catholics. If he did so, it must have been either by teaching *ex cathedrâ* the Monothelite heresy, or else by teaching *ex cathedrâ* some doctrine on the legitimate *expression* of revealed dogma. We will take these two suppositions successively; and first inquire whether, as Universal Teacher, he enforced Monothelism.

In January, 1869, (pp. 192-202) we printed at length Honorius's first Letter, and also the extant remains of his second. The one thing which on the surface will strike every reader is, that his pronouncements on *dogma* are entirely ministrative and subordinate to his pronouncements on *phraseology*. We are not as yet inquiring, whether the pronouncements on phraseology are doctrinal or disciplinary: we are only saying, that they obviously compose the pith and drift of the Letters. Honorius's whole position is: "there is no *dogmatic* difference whatever; why then cause dis-

* There is a supplementary side of the Ultramontane doctrine, with which we are not here concerned: viz., the indefectible purity of Roman tradition. See our last number, p. 197. Never was this indefectible purity placed in a clearer light, than by every attendant circumstance of the Monothelite controversy.

union by a most ill-advised *expression*?" However, we must go into the thing more fully.

If Honorius taught Monothelism *ex cathedrâ*, he did so by obliging all Catholics to hold, either (1) that in Christ there is but one energy, or else (2) that in Christ there is but one will. Did he command Catholics then to hold, that in Christ there is but one energy? So far from it, that the direct purpose of his Letters was to prohibit or dissuade Easterns from using the phrase *at all*: on the very ground, that it was an inexpedient expression of Catholic dogma.

Was he then commanding Catholics to hold, that in Christ there is but one *will*? Such a supposition is almost as singular as the former. The question which he was asked, concerned exclusively the "one energy"; and if ever there were an obiter dictum in the world, such was his declaration concerning our Lord's one will. On the contrary supposition, his Letters must be analyzed in some such sense as this. "In reply to your question, I earnestly exhort you not to say, either that in Christ there are two energies, or that in Christ there is only one energy. But (by the way) I take this opportunity of answering *another* question, which *no one* has asked me; of commanding you and all Catholics to believe, with divine faith, that in Him there is only one will. You must never say that there is only one energy; yet you must firmly believe and loudly profess that there is only one will." Whoever can read Honorius's Letters and be satisfied with this analysis, is far beyond the reach of any argument we can adduce.

Mr. Renouf himself is not, of course, responsible for this particular paradox: because he admits that Honorius was not purporting to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine. Yet even such a version as *he* must give of the Letters, is most curious. And there is one further circumstance, which is simply final and conclusive. Mr. Renouf urges (p. 27), that when Honorius wrote his second Letter, he had been thoroughly informed by S. Sophronius's envoys on the whole facts of the controversy; and at all events the Pope most indubitably knew that that patriarch earnestly repudiated Monothelism. If then, as Mr. Renouf thinks, Honorius had in his first Letter authoritatively taught Monothelism as the revealed dogma, Sophronius in the Pope's eyes must have been neither more nor less than a condemned heretic; not only no Catholic bishop, but not even a Catholic. Yet in his second Letter Honorius calls Sophronius a "brother and fellow-bishop": and (which is still more peremptorily decisive) speaks of the Saint's envoys as having made the whole submission which he (the Pope) desired at their hand, when they *conditionally* promised that their patriarch should no longer use the *expression* about Christ's "two energies." As to any retraction of the Duothelistic *dogma*, it is not so much as distantly hinted at.

Indeed, the theory that Honorius taught Monothelism *ex cathedrâ*, is best refuted by being fully stated. If he was a Monothelite, he necessarily understood that the Western tradition was intensely Duothelistic: yet it is most certain, that he neither circulated his Letter among Westerns, nor took any step whatever towards extirpating their Duothelism. According therefore to the theory which we are assailing, his purpose was, that the *East* indeed should be orthodox, but that his own Church and all the West except himself should continue to hold what he accounted heresy.

In fact the only mistaken definition which can be ascribed to Honorius without simple absurdity, concerns, not the dogma, but its expression. It may be contended that Honorius taught *ex cathedrâ* the doctrine, that either of those two phrases—"one energy," "two energies,"—is an inappropriate expression of the revealed verity. But, as it oddly happens, the last sentence of the second Letter is as simply fatal to any such supposition, as though Honorius had presaged the future controversy, and had resolved to make all misconception impossible. S. Sophronius's envoys promised that their patriarch would abstain from the phrase "two energies," if Cyrus would only abstain from the phrase "one energy": and with this promise Honorius declared himself abundantly satisfied. On the view which we are opposing, Honorius had commanded Sophronius, Cyrus, and all other Catholics, to hold with *irreformable interior assent*, that the two phrases are both of them inappropriate. Yet what are the facts? So far from *commanding* them to hold any such *doctrine*, he did not even *ask* them to form any such *opinion*. All he desired was external conformity; and he obtained his full purpose, as soon as that external conformity was secured. The whole proceeding was disciplinary, not doctrinal, from beginning to end.

As a last resource it may be alleged, that Honorius imposed an obligation of holding, as a dogmatic fact, that Sergius's and Cyrus's denial of the "two energies" was no denial of revealed truth. But it is certain, as we have already shown, that S. Sophronius's envoys made the whole submission which Honorius desired at their hand. It is certain therefore, *either* that the Saint came to hold that Sergius's and Cyrus's denial of the "two energies" was no denial of revealed truth, or else that the Pope never imposed on him any *obligation* of holding this. But the former branch of the alternative is simply out of the question. Honorius was undeniably doing everything he could towards promoting union between Sophronius and Sergius; and if therefore he could possibly have told the latter that the former withdrew his accusation of heresy, he would beyond all question have said as much most loudly and emphatically. Since therefore S. Sophronius did *not* withdraw his accusation of heresy—and since nevertheless he made all the concession which

Honorius demanded of him—it follows that Honorius never imposed on him any *obligation* of withdrawing the charge of heresy. But if Honorius imposed no such obligation on *Sophronius*, certainly he imposed no such obligation on *the whole Church*. It is demonstratively certain therefore, that Honorius never imposed on the whole Church any obligation of holding, that Sergius's and Cyrus's denial of the "two energies" was no denial of revealed truth. In other words, it is demonstratively certain that Honorius never taught this *ex cathedrâ* as a dogmatical fact.

We have defined then an *ex cathedrâ* Act, as an Act in which some Pope purports to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine. And this definition being supposed, we say, with the utmost confidence that Honorius did not teach any false doctrine *ex cathedrâ*. We say this with the utmost confidence; because no one can so much as *name* any one false doctrine, in regard to which he will even *allege* that Honorius imposed on the whole Church an obligation of believing it.

There remains however one difficulty of a broader and more general kind, which may be felt even by those who admit that our arguments establish the full conclusions for which we have adduced them. At last, it may be said, all this is a mere fine-spun theory, which may satisfy mere controversialists, but which is repulsive rather than otherwise to practical men. If a Pope can be permitted by the Holy Ghost to "throw the whole weight of his See into the heretical scale"—if he can be permitted to give an answer which has a widespread and potent effect in disseminating heresy—then practically it is not safe to trust Rome's doctrinal guidance. If Catholics were turned aside from revealed truths by following the very guide whom God had given them, it was God Himself who led them astray.

This objection supposes, as we have said, that the facts of Honorius's case are as we have represented them: and this therefore of course we are to assume in our reply. That reply then is simple enough. We do not question the fact, that Honorius's Letters may have served as an excuse for numbers, who, on totally different grounds, chose to embrace Monothelism. But we maintain that none who really wished to ascertain and follow the judgment of the Holy See, could possibly be so hoodwinked. Those who were really bitten by the heresy, could not but see (if only they chose to look) that Honorius's Letters, even interpreted in their own light, set forth the precise contradictory of Monothelism. But even were this otherwise, no sincere inquirers could acquiesce in any given version of Honorius's meaning, until they had read that letter of Sergius's to which Honorius's was a reply. In doing so, they would at once see how simply Sergius had aimed at deceiving

Honorius: for (to mention no other particulars) they would read therein the shameless lie, that there was no dogmatic difference between Sophronius and the writer.

The fair way to estimate the value of Rome's doctrinal guidance will be this. Let us suppose some Eastern bishop really perplexed by the new heresy, and at the same time firmly resolved to make the judgment of Rome his one Rule of Faith. He sends envoys to the eternal city, and in due time they forward him their report. They find Roman tradition intensely Duothelistic, and no one more profoundly penetrated by that tradition than the Pontiff himself. They have been unable indeed to persuade him, that Sergius can really be questioning so very elementary an article of the Faith as Duothelism; and they have also found him strongly wedded to his opinion, that the phrase, "two energies," is a most inappropriate and unwisely-chosen expression. As to the former of these points however, he has made no attempt to force on them his own view; and they know that, on such a matter of fact, those who live in the midst of the controversy must be indefinitely better judges than a Pope who resides thousands of miles off. On the appropriate dogmatic *expression*, the case is different: and not improbably their reverence for the Holy See might lead both themselves and their bishop to suspect, that S. Sophronius has made a mistake in laying such uncompromising stress on the phrase "two energies." This is the amount of doctrinal evil which they would suffer through Honorius's perverseness. And (considering that the Church had as yet said nothing whatever on the appropriateness of that phrase) no one will say that such evil is very serious.*

We by no means wish to extenuate the disastrous results of Honorius's fault, but they were utterly different from what the objection supposes. He was called on by his office at once to anathematize the new heresy, and to define *ex cathedrâ* "the two energies." He would thus have expelled the heresiarchs from the Church, and compelled Eastern bishops promptly to take their choice between Duothelism and excommunication; whereas, by

* S. Sophronius himself may be supposed to illustrate the very supposition we have made. But there is one essential difference between his case and that of our imaginary bishop, because he was far too firm in the Faith to have suffered a moment's perplexity. He regarded the Monothelites from the first as open heretics: in that they denied an elementary revealed dogma, which the Church had from the first implicitly enforced as such.

Mr. Renouf (p. 11 and note) says, in effect, that neither Arians nor Monothelites could be formal heretics, until the Church had expressly condemned them. We must protest most earnestly against this statement: though it would carry us entirely too far, if we attempted duly to set forth its falsehood and omnigenous mischievousness. See, however, Perrone de Locis theologicis, par. 3, n. 339.

neglecting to do this, he allowed the heresy to assume far larger and less manageable proportions. Moreover he discredited and discouraged the orthodox champion; praised and encouraged the heresiarch; denounced the phrase which was imperatively needed for the maintenance of revealed truth. But all this is quite different in *kind* from such mischief as the present objectors ascribe to him: quite different in kind from leading those into heresy, who consulted him under the sincere belief that he was their divinely appointed teacher.

We must not conclude without a very few final remarks on Mr. Renouf himself. And firstly as to what F. Bottalla so justly reprobates: his language towards "some of the most eminent writers whom the Catholic Church has produced." To our amazement, he speaks (p. 73 et alibi) of our own "overbearing and insulting language" towards himself. Our language concerning *him* is quite milk-and-water, in comparison with the language he has used against his most illustrious opponents. He should speak with respect of others, if he wishes himself to be treated with respect.

It is not however only to eminent Catholic theologians, but to the Church's supreme authority, that Mr. Renouf has had an opportunity of exhibiting disloyalty. His first pamphlet was placed on the Index, as containing unsound doctrine and as perilous to unwary readers. Mr. Renouf no less simply ignores the existence of this censure, than if it had proceeded from the Presbyterian Assembly or (say) the London Court of Common Council.

At last however, our chief complaint against Mr. Renouf is his reticence on his own positive doctrine. The opinion on which he insists, is an opinion held by him in common with Protestants, deists, and atheists; viz. that a Pope is not infallible when speaking *ex cathedra*. Persons anxious for truth rather inquire who *is* infallible, than who is *not*: yet on this question he is profoundly silent; and we on our part, therefore, must speak hypothetically. If he holds the Gallican doctrine, we have no very severe remark to make; for he does but hold a doctrine which as yet is tolerated by the Holy See. But in his first pamphlet (p. 32, note) he called it "*the old view* that both Popes and Councils may err, and that *the Church alone* is infallible." Twice we have called his attention to the possibility that these words may be understood, as vesting infallibility exclusively in the body of the faithful; but we have entirely failed to elicit from him any disclaimer. We can only say therefore, that *if* he intends to maintain this tenet, all Catholics must account him (for reasons given in an earlier article of our number) as a rebel against the Church's authority and as an enemy to the Catholic Faith.

SINCE the preceding article has been in type, our attention has been called to one of Mr. Renouf's arguments which we have not explicitly met. That gentleman alleges (p. 60) that S. Leo II. classed Honorius among the "inventors" of Monothelism; a fact which would of course be inconsistent with our allegation, that he did not regard his predecessor as having been infected with the heresy *at all*. We reply confidently by denying the assumed premiss. Undoubtedly S. Leo drew a distinction, between the *original* promoters of the heresy, who were all dead when he wrote;—and their *subsequent* "imitators and accomplices," many of whom were still alive. But he included among its original promoters, not only its "inventors"—Sergius, Cyrus, &c., &c.—but also the contemporary Pope; who, instead of promptly repressing it as was his bounden duty, "permitted the immaculate to be polluted"; contended against the phrase "two energies"; and "died" without repenting his "error." We maintain that S. Leo's words, even taken by themselves, are utterly incapable of the sense which Mr. Renouf gives them; because to say that Honorius "*permitted*" the heresy to grow, is to deny by the very force of terms that he was one of its "*inventors*." What man in his senses would say, that Luther *permitted* Protestantism to infect the Church? But over and above this, it is flagrantly inconsistent with the most obvious historical facts—and so S. Leo must necessarily have known—to represent Honorius as co-*inventor* of the heresy with Sergius and Cyrus. Even Mr. Renouf must admit, that their system was completed before they brought it in any way under the Pope's notice.

As we have added to our article, we may as well make a different remark. The "Pall Mall Gazette" of March 7th makes the astounding statement, that "it would be impossible to describe in too emphatic language the equanimity with which the ordinary" Catholic "layman of the day would endure being called a Monothelite"; and that even "Papal controversialists take much the same view of the accusation." We cannot be surprised that this sagacious and well-informed scribe should regard the Ultramontane arguments on the Honorius case as showing "the utmost audacity of historical assertion": though that description in truth rather applies, to the incredibly impudent reasoning which *Gallicans* base on that Pontiff's condemnation. Such however are the blind leaders of the blind in this "enlightened" Protestant country. "*Populus vult decipi et decipitur.*"

ART. V.—DR. MOLLOY ON GEOLOGY AND
REVELATION.

Geology and Revelation ; or, the Ancient History of the Earth, considered in the light of Geological Facts and Revealed Religion. With Illustrations. By the Rev. GERALD MOLLOY, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth.

THE very first sentence in the Introductory chapter of Dr. Molloy's book startled us not a little:—"Among the various pursuits that engage the human mind, there are few so attractive as Geology." When, many years ago, we first addressed ourselves to the study of this science—if science it could then be called—it was to us anything but attractive. We had not, however, proceeded far in our perusal of the work before us until we discovered that Geology, though at first sight,* and in its naked details and strange nomenclature, dry and repulsive enough, could, by the touches of a master-hand, be made not only a tolerable, but a pleasant and even fascinating study.

The main *object* of the work is, as the title sufficiently indicates, purely theological; but of the *matter*, not more than one-fourth bears the slightest trace of reference to theological discussion. In this arrangement the author has, we think, shown excellent judgment; for from it is derived the peculiar value as well as the singular charm of the volume.

There are two records of the creation of the world: one contained in the book of Genesis, and written by the inspired author many long ages ago; the other, which has come to light only in latter days, is derived from varied and extensive examinations—so far as examination can go—of the component elements of the earth itself. These investigations have been carried on by land and sea in every quarter of the globe; they have been prosecuted with unfailing ardour and marvellous success down to the present day; and their results constitute what is called the science of geology. Now, on one hand, the apparent as well as more commonly-received interpretation of the inspired record would comprise within a few natural days the whole period intervening between the first creation of matter

* *At first sight.* For there is no subject of human study which, however dry and unattractive in itself, may not become pleasing and even absorbing by long familiarity with it.

and the introduction of man upon the now completely furnished scene of his great trial and mighty destiny; whereas, on the other hand, "geologists maintain that the crust of the earth has been slowly built up by means of a long series of operations, which would require hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of years for their accomplishment; whereas the Bible narrative, it is alleged, allows but the short lapse of six or eight thousand years from the creation of the world to the present time. The geological record, then, seems to contradict the Mosaic; and the question is, how this apparent contradiction is to be explained?"

Some, continues Dr. Molloy, have ventured to solve the problem by rejecting the historical narrative of the Bible; others by ignoring the plain facts of geology. But there is a third class of writers, including many names of the highest eminence and authority, who contend that we may admit the extreme antiquity of our globe, which geology so imperatively demands, without compromising in the smallest degree the truthfulness of the Mosaic story. They say that the chronology of the Bible stops short with Adam, and does not go back to the beginning of the world. By means of the data which the Bible supplies we may calculate, at least roughly, the lapse of time from the creation of Adam to the birth of Christ. But from the first beginning of all created things, when God made the heavens and the earth, to the close of the sixth day, when Adam was introduced upon the scene, there is an interval which, in the Bible narrative, is left altogether undefined and uncertain. This is the view which we hope to develope and to illustrate in the course of the following pages (p. 5).

Writers of the third class, so far as we have seen, are all more or less chargeable with one or other of the following mistakes. They give too much hard, dry, geological details, and thereby repel the uninitiated reader; or they give too little, and suppose what is omitted to be already known; or they mix up the geological and theological, so as to create a certain confusion and vagueness of conception in the mind. Dr. Molloy must have noticed these faults, for he has succeeded to perfection in keeping clear of them all. He divides his essay into two distinct parts. In the first part he confines himself exclusively to the statement and explanation of the geological phenomena; and in this, though at the outset distinctly professing to give nothing of his own, he really shows great originality—for original mental power is often displayed just as much in the manner of treating the discoveries of others as in discovering for oneself. In the first place, he puts aside all mere theories, and confines himself entirely to facts, and inferences fairly deducible from these facts—to those "general conclusions upon which all geologists are substantially agreed, and which, they assure us,

are established by evidence that is absolutely irresistible" (p. 10). Secondly, he selects from the highest and latest authorities, chiefly Sir Charles Lyell, a number of details, and groups and classifies them. He gives quite enough for the purpose he has in view, and gives not one too much; so that a student who merely wishes to acquire such a knowledge of geology as is necessary for the clear and full understanding of the subject, as it bears on the Mosaic narrative, will find all he wants in this book, and need not open any other. Indeed, quite irrespective of that question, it contains all the information that general readers, not engaging in the study as a specialty, would care for having. Then the author so explains terms and phrases, and so simplifies and illustrates as he goes along, that a person of ordinary intelligence, though previously quite ignorant of the subject, can read on without pause, taking in the clear and full meaning as he reads. But what imparts to the book its principal attraction, at least for ordinary readers, is the happy skill which the author displays in the selection of his facts and illustrations. It is not an exaggeration to say that the book combines the accuracy and reality of a purely scientific exposition with much of the charm of a romance.

In the first chapter Dr. Molloy gives a brief but lucid statement of the elementary facts of geology and of the general theory by which these facts are accounted for. The crust or shell of the earth, so far from being one round mass of homogeneous matter, is, on the contrary, composed of a number of substances entirely different in quality and varying in their arrangement; all of which, however, whether soft or hard, are in the technical language of geology called *rocks*. These rocks are arranged in three divisions, which have also their subdivisions. First, there are the *Stratified rocks*, so called because they are found to lie one over the other in successive strata or layers—strata of clay, chalk, sand, &c. They are also called *Aqueous rocks*, because, according to the geological theory, they had been originally formed under water—the process of their formation extending through many thousands of years or of ages. The next division comprises the *Igneous rocks*, so called, because, according to the same theory, owing to the action of intense subterraneous heat—the actual existence of which, even at the present day, is admitted by all*—they had once been in a state of fusion; and in the cooling lapse of time

* "Upon one point all are agreed, that within the crust of the earth an intense heat very generally prevails—a heat so intense that it would be quite sufficient, acting under ordinary circumstances, to reduce all known rocks to a state of igneous fusion" (pp. 16, 17).

had gradually settled into their existing indurated condition. The rocks of this class most commonly known are the granite. To the third division belong the Metamorphic rocks. "In some respects they resemble the Aqueous rocks, while, in others, they are more nearly allied to the Igneous. Like the former, they are stratified in their outward arrangement; like the latter, they are more or less crystalline in their internal texture. As to their origin, we are told that they were first deposited under water like the Aqueous rocks, and that afterwards their internal structure was altered by the agency of subterranean heat. Hence the name Metamorphic, first suggested by Sir Charles Lyell, which conveys the idea that these rocks have undergone a *change of form*. To this group belong many varieties of slate, and also the far-famed statuary marble of Italy" (pp. 14, 15).

But, besides the component materials and the structure of these rocks, there is another and most extraordinary class of phenomena displayed in them. For of this mighty rock-system "we are told by geologists that it is a vast sepulchre, within which lie entombed the remains of life that has long since passed away. Each series of strata is but a new range of tombs; and each tomb has a story of its own. Here a gigantic monster is disclosed to view, compared to which the largest beast that now roams through the forest is puny in form and contemptible in strength; there, within a narrow space, millions of minute animal frames are found closely compacted together, each so small that its existence can be detected only by the aid of a powerful microscope. In one place whole skeletons are found almost entire, imbedded in the bosom of the solid rock; in another we have a boundless profusion of bones and shells; and again in another, neither the skeleton itself appears, nor yet its scattered bones, but simply the imprint of footsteps once left upon the sandy beach, and still remaining engraved on the stone, into which the fine sand has been converted chiefly by the agency of pressure These remains of animals and plants imbedded in the crust of the earth are called Fossils; and geologists maintain that the fossils preserved in each group of strata represent the animals and plants that flourished on the surface of the earth, or in the waters of the ocean, when that group of strata was in process of formation. There they lived, and there they died, and there they were buried, in the sand, or the shingle, or the mud that came down from the waters above. Their descendants, however, still lived on, and new forms of life were called into being by the voice of the Omnipotent Creator, making, as it were, a connecting link between the new age of the world that was coming in and the

old one that was passing away. But they too died and found a tomb beneath the waters; for Nature, with unexhausted energies, was still busy collecting materials from the old rocks, and building up the new. And so that age passed away like the former, and another came; and every age was represented by its own group of strata; and each group of strata was, in its turn, covered over with a new deposit; and the tombs were all sealed up, with their countless legions of dead, their massive monuments of stone, their strange hieroglyphic inscriptions. At length came the last stage of the world's history, and man appeared upon the scene" (pp. 23-25).

Here we have, in clear and distinct outline, at once the leading facts and the main theory of geology. Of the facts there can be no question. There are the rocks stratified and unstratified; open to the eye, open to the axe and the hammer. There are the stony skeletons and the stony footprints. These are the *facts*. That the earth's crust, as it now exists, came direct and at once from the hand of the Creator was the common belief before the dawn of modern inquiry. That, on the contrary, it was the result of many stupendous revolutions, the work of countless ages, carried on under the agency of fire and water; and that the skeletons and footprints now found imbedded in it are those of creatures that once lived and moved—this is the geological *theory*. To the elucidation of this theory, and of the arguments by which it is enforced and defended, Dr. Molloy devotes the remainder (nearly 300 pages) of the first section of his book. The following is his statement of the broad and general principle on which the whole fabric of the geological argument rests. It is given with the intrepid fairness and philosophic moderation which characterize the whole discussion:—

In the physical sciences it is a common principle of reasoning to account for the phenomena that come before us in nature by the operation of natural causes which we know to exist. Nay, this principle seems to be almost an instinct of our nature, which guides even the least philosophical amongst us in the common affairs of life. When we stand amidst the ruins of an ancient castle, we feel quite certain that we have before us, not alone the monument of time's destroying power, but also the monument of human skill and labour in days gone by. We entertain no doubt that ages ago the sound of the mason's hammer was heard upon these walls, now crowned with ivy; that these moss-grown stones were once hewn fresh in the quarry, and piled up one upon another by human hands; and that the building itself was designed by human skill, and intended for the purposes of human habitation and defence. Or, if we see a footprint in the sand, we conclude that a living foot has been there; and from the character of the traces it has left we judge what was the species of animal to which it belonged—whether man, or bird,

or beast. It is true that God is omnipotent. He might, if it had so pleased Him, have built the old castle at the creation of the world, and allowed it to crumble into ruins ; or He might have built yesterday, and made a ruin begin to be where no castle had stood before, and covered the stones with moss, and mantled the walls in ivy. And as to the footprints in the sand, it were as easy for Him to make the impress there as to make the foot that left the impress. All this is true ; but yet, if any one were to argue in this style against us, he would fail to shake our convictions : we should still unhesitatingly believe that human hands once built the castle, and that a living foot once trod the shore.

Now this principle of reasoning is the foundation on which the ablest modern geologists claim to build their science. The untiring hand of nature is ever busy around us ; they ask us to come and look at her works, and to judge of what she has done in past ages by what she is now doing before our eyes. She is still, they say, building up her strata all over the globe, of limestone, and sandstone, and clay ; she is still lifting up in one place the bed of the ocean, and in another submerging the dry land ; she is still bursting open the crust of the earth by the action of internal fire, disturbing and tilting up the horizontal strata ; she is still upheaving her mountains, and scooping out her valleys. All these operations are open to our inspection ; we may go forth and study them for ourselves ; we may examine the works that are wrought, and we may discover, too, the causes by which they are produced. And if it should appear that a very close analogy exists between these works that are now coming into existence, and the long series of works that are piled up in the crust of the earth, it is surely not unreasonable to refer the latter class of phenomena to the action of the same natural causes which we know to have produced the former (pp. 27-29).

Having thus introduced our readers into the broad highway of the inquiry, our proper course, perhaps, should be to leave them to follow our author himself as he unfolds his "wild and wondrous" tale, and passes in review on his pictured canvas the marvels that are witnessed on the surface of the earth, or lie hidden in its depths and in the depths of the sea. But we would fain enrich our pages with a few selected details which, without over-testing the patience of those who are already acquainted with them, cannot but prove highly interesting to those who are not.

The process of denudation, which has from earliest time been going on over the whole surface of the earth, forms one of the broadest and most striking elements of the geological induction. It is so called from its denuding or laying bare surfaces that were previously covered. "The process of denudation is the work of many and various natural causes. Heat and cold, rain, hail and snow, chemical affinities, the atmosphere itself, all have a share in it ; but the largest share belongs to the mechanical action of moving water. Every little rill that flows down the

mountain side is charged with finely-powdered sediment, which it is ever wearing away from the surface of its own bed" (pp. 21, 22). In the larger streams, the agency of denudation is of course still more conspicuous; but it is in the great rivers of the world that its mighty and extensive influence is seen. It has been calculated that the waters of the Rhine, impregnated as they are with carbonic acid, and therefore acting powerfully in dissolving limestone rock, carry each year to the sea a quantity of carbonate of lime sufficient for the formation of more than thirty thousand millions of oyster-shells. According to another calculation, founded on observations made with the greatest care, the river Ganges, during the four rainy months of each year, carries past a point, full five hundred miles distant from its mouth, the enormous quantity of six thousand millions of cubic feet of mud—a mass of mineral matter "sufficient to form a stratum of rock one foot in height, and two hundred and eighteen square miles in extent" (p. 37). Other high authorities tell us that the Mississippi sweeps down nearly four thousand millions of cubic feet of earth every year; while the Yellow River, in China, discharges not less than forty-eight millions every day.

So great are both the erosive and motive powers of current water, and so prodigious is the increase of this power in proportion to the increased velocity of the water, that we often read of common rivers, swollen by sudden rains, overflowing their banks, flooding the adjacent country, uprooting and crushing and sweeping before their mighty and merciless fury everything that impedes their course,—immense rocks, huge forest-trees, stately and strong-built houses, landmarks natural and artificial, which the hand of man or of time had been consolidating for generations. Thus, in the year 1829, "the river Dee swept away a bridge of five arches, built of solid granite, which had stood uninjured for twenty years; the whole mass of masonry sank into the bed of the stream and was seen no more" (p. 42). So the river Don once heaved up an inclined plane, and left there, four or five hundred tons' weight of stone; and in the year 1827, an obscure rivulet in Northumberland swept to the distance of a quarter of a mile "a large block of greenstone-porphry weighing nearly two tons" (*ibid.*). Examples of this kind might be multiplied without end.

These are, however, but limited and intermittent outbreaks of despotic power compared with the tremendous, ceaseless, world-wide assailing energies of the mighty Ocean—*βαθυρρεταο μεγα σθενος Ωκεανος*. Round every island pillowed in the deep, round the great continents, against every rock-bound coast, through every inlet and fissure, day and night and day and

night for evermore, this mad war of water against land is raging, and its deafening and incessant roar is heard. Now tempest-driven, now tide-convulsed, now both together, with ever-unwearied force and in every clime, "the big waves lash the frightened shore." There is in the visible world no other conflict like this. Within the range of authentic history, islands that dotted the sea and braved its fury for ages, have been carried clean away, and left not a trace behind them. In the first half of the seventeenth century, an island, that about four centuries before had formed part of the mainland of Denmark, was flooded by the sea, and six thousand of the inhabitants perished: only three islet-fragments now remain, peering above the desolate waters; and they, too, are gradually melting away. The island of Heligoland, in the same sea, was, five centuries ago, four times as large as it is now: the little that still remains is becoming less and less; and it, too, in the course of time, will have vanished altogether. In many parts of the British Isles, the waste of land, by the inroads of the sea, has been going on in a similar way. Towards the close of the last century, a whole village on the eastern coast of Scotland was invaded by the sea, and in a single night swallowed up by the wild waves that are rolling there still. In England, the coast of Yorkshire is being to a great extent eaten away, and its tall chalk cliffs are crumbling into the whitened surf below. And so everywhere, age after age, this restless and potent creature carries on the work of Him who made it, and, for His own high designs, gave it that work to do.

So much for the denuding power of water in its fluid state. We should be glad to present our readers with some details of the power of the same element in its congealed form, especially of glaciers drifted out to sea, with huge masses of earth and stones imbedded in them or lying on their surface, and fastened thereto with icy cramps. These floating mountains, in this state called icebergs, are sometimes found to be several miles in length, rising above the water more than two hundred feet, and dipping into it more than a thousand feet. Approaching the warmer latitudes, they gradually melt into the sea, depositing at its bottom the stones and mud which they had torn from the denuded valleys thousands of miles away. But for the formation of these huge ice-hills, and for the effects they produce by land and sea; and for the constructing (we have spoken of the denuding) power of the watery element, which is being actually exercised over the globe, in the formation of stratified rocks, so closely resembling those that form the crust of the earth; and for the story of the fossil remains that are entombed in each successive tier of that crust; and for the geological argument

founded on these phenomena;—for all this we must send our readers to Dr. Molloy's book. Having thus dismissed the first great element, water, and the work it has been doing within the period of man's history, and the work it is thence so justly inferred to have done long before that history began, we have now to say a few words on the other great element—fire.

And here, as in the former case, there are the geological facts and the geological theory. That under the whole, or nearly the whole of the earth's crust, there lies a vast body of fire, is partly an attested fact, and partly an inference legitimately drawn from attested facts. From experiments and observations made in all parts of the earth, in coal-pits, mines, &c., it is found that, at no great distance below the surface, heat is felt very sensibly; and it is, moreover, found that the intensity of this heat increases rapidly in proportion to the depth. “‘In one and the same mine,’ says Sir John Herschel, ‘each particular depth has its own particular degree of heat, which never varies: but the lower always the hotter; and that not by a trifling, but what may be called an astonishingly rapid rate of increase,—about a degree of the thermometer additional warmth for every ninety feet of additional depth, which is about 58° per mile!—so that, if we had a shaft sunk a mile deep, we should find in the rock a heat of 105° , which is much hotter than the hottest summer day ever experienced in England.’ Now, if the temperature continue to increase at this rate towards the centre of the earth, it is quite certain that at no very great distance from the surface, the heat would be sufficiently intense to reduce the hardest granite and the most refractory metals to a state of igneous fusion” (p. 253).

There are other proofs of the existence of this subterranean fire, drawn from the volcanos, active and extinct, which are so widely scattered over the surface of the globe; and from hot springs, which are also found in almost every country in the world.

The Andes, the most remarkable of all mountain-ranges for its continuous length, extending from one extremity of South America to the other, “is studded over with volcanos, most of which have been seen in active operation within the last three hundred years” (p. 259). This vast volcanic chain, stretching along the Pacific Ocean, from Tierra del Fuego to the isthmus of Panama, rises again on the other side of that isthmus, and finally terminates only with the Rocky Mountains far on in North America. There are similar volcanic lines, though not extending so far, in Europe, Asia and Africa—to say nothing of the isolated groups of volcanos found in these continents or in islands of the ocean.

Hot springs are, as we have said, to be seen in almost every country, England included. Italy abounds in them. But it is in Iceland—that island of eternal snow and frost, that dreary home of the blue fox and the eider duck—it is there that the most striking examples are found, not only of hot springs but of insular volcanic fires. Every one has heard of the Geysers—so these Iceland wells are called—especially the Great Geyser, with its recurring explosions and ebullitions, succeeded by intervals of repose, and its daily grand display, when “such volumes of steam rush forth as to obscure the atmosphere for half a mile round, and a vast column of water is projected to a height of from one to two hundred feet, and continues for a quarter of an hour to play like an artificial fountain” (p. 255). Every one has also heard of Hecla, the great burning mountain in the same island, with its three peaks and many craters, its entrails of fire and its coat of snow. More than forty of its eruptions have been recorded—some of them lasting for six years. Of these the greatest and most terrific occurred in 1783, when the lava thrown up filled several glens and lakes to the depth of some hundreds of feet. In another great eruption, though not so terrible, about twenty-five years ago, the ashes were carried as far as the Orkney Islands.

Of the wide, if not absolutely universal, extension of this subterranean fire there can, then, exist no reasonable doubt—though, that it occupies, or rather forms, the inner globe, from the concave surface of the crust to the centre of the earth, while probable, is not demonstrated. Now, the two geological phenomena which this internal heat is said to account for are these. First, the strata of the earth's crust are not only composed of different materials, but in one stratum are found imbedded the remains of forest trees and land animals; in another are found the remains of aquatic animals. When, therefore, the trees and animals of the former stratum flourished, the stratum must have been above water; it must have afterwards been submerged, and again finally upheaved. In like manner, when the animals of the second stratum lived, the stratum must have been under water, and afterwards upheaved. Again, when a vertical section of the crust discloses a number of these strata alternating with each other, there must have been several submersions and upheavings. Secondly, it is found that in many places these strata do not lie horizontally one over another, but inclined to the horizon at angles of various degrees; as if some stupendous interior force had violently disturbed and tilted them up. These are the two phenomena, which geologists say are perfectly accounted for by the subterranean fire. Their proof is as follows.

This subterranean fire has been within the period of authentic history, and is, in our own day, producing phenomena, not of course to anything like the same extent, but exactly of the same kind. These effects are produced in three forms, distinct indeed but closely associated—the volcano, the earthquake, and the gentle undulation of the earth's crust. Of volcanos we have already said a few words; for further details and illustrations regarding them and undulations we must refer our readers to Dr. Molloy's book. We close this section of our article with the following extracts from an account—the most complete, we believe, yet published—of a tremendous earthquake, so recent in date, that the report of it is still ringing in our ears. The sources from which Dr. Molloy's sketch is derived are chiefly a series of letters written upon the scene of the catastrophe by persons of high authority, and published in the *Times* newspaper, together with Captain Powel's Report to the Admiralty.

On the western coast of South America there is a long, narrow strip of land, lying between the lofty crests of the Andes and the shores of the Pacific Ocean, which from the earliest time has been the familiar home of earthquakes. Towards evening on the 13th of August, 1868, this fated region was the scene of a convulsion the most appalling and destructive that has been recorded within the present century. The disturbance was felt in its extreme violence for a distance of 15,000 miles along the coast; from Ibarra, one degree north of the equator, to Iquique, more than twenty degrees south. In ten minutes from the first shock 20,000 people perished, and a vast amount of property, roughly estimated at £60,000,000 sterling, was utterly destroyed. Many thriving towns were levelled to the ground. Even the very ruins were not spared. The sea rushed in when the earthquake shock had ceased, and carried everything before it in one universal wreck; so that in some cases not a vestige remained behind to tell the dismayed survivors where their homesteads once had stood. It might be fancied perhaps that the cities seated aloft in the security of the eternal hills were beyond the reach of the convulsion that shook the plain below. But no; Arequipa, far up on the slopes of the Western Cordillera, and Pasco, the highest city in the world, situated on a level with the snowy summit of the Jungfrau, were shattered into fragments with the same violence as the cities on the coast.

The various incidents recorded by the survivors are full of fearful interest. At Iquique, according to one account, about five o'clock in the evening of the 13th of August, a rumbling noise was heard, then the earth shook violently for some minutes, then the sea with a great moan retired from the shore, and rearing itself into a tremendous wave, rushed back upon the land and swept away the town. . . .

A good deal of shipping was lying in the Bay of Arica. When the waters first receded the vessels were all carried out to sea, chains, cables, and anchors snapping asunder like packthread. A moment afterwards they were borne back irresistibly by the returning wave, and dashed to pieces on the coast. One more fortunate than the rest, a vessel of war belonging to the United

States Government, was caught up on the crest of the wave, and with the loss of only one man was landed high and dry among the sand hills a quarter of a mile from the shore. . . . (pp. 290-2).

Earthquakes of such tremendous violence are rare. But, without taking into account what occurs in the depths of the ocean, or in those parts of the earth that are shut out from the penetrating eye of scientific observation, it has been calculated that minor earthquake shocks happen on an average not less than two or three times every week. They are so frequent in certain parts of Central and Southern America, that, it is said, the inhabitants think no more of counting them than we think of counting the showers of rain.

A few words now on the second division of Dr. Molloy's work. After having in the first part explained the geological theory, and the argument on which it is based, he commences his second, the theological part, by an explicit and decided acceptance of that theory and that argument. He accepts the proposition which affirms that the formation of the earth's crust, as it now exists and has existed so far back as we have any historic record of it, is the result of an indefinite series of revolutions carried on through an indefinite series of ages; and that therefore it is not the work of six natural days.

That the interpretation of the Mosaic record, which fixed the creation of man only six days later than the creation of the world, prevailed down to a quite recent period, is undeniable; but, as Dr. Molloy justly remarks, it was "not founded on a close and scientific examination of the sacred text. The hypothesis of a long and eventful state of existence prior to the creation of man may be said rather to have been *overlooked*, than to have been *rejected*, by our commentators" (pp. 322-3). The discoveries of geology have in latter times forced men into a closer examination of the Scripture language and of the Church tradition; and the result is that the theory of indefinite periods has been pronounced by high and orthodox authorities to be perfectly reconcilable with both. Dr. Molloy names the late Cardinal Wiseman—whose work was first published about thirty-four years ago—followed by F. Perrone, the great Roman theologian, and more recently by F. Pianciani, another distinguished Roman divine.* A host of other learned writers, Protestant and Catholic, have taken up the same ground. There are two, or rather three, theories on the subject. According to

* F. Pianciani's first publication appeared about twenty years ago. It was written in Latin, and occupies over 200 pages. He afterwards supplied to the *Civiltà Cattolica* a series of essays on the same subject, written in Italian. These essays were, about eight years ago, republished in a volume of over 500 pages. Of course, it is this latter work which Dr. Molloy quotes.

the first theory the long indefinite ages intervened between the first creation of matter and the first of the Mosaic days; and it was on this first day that God commenced the immediate preparation of the earth for man's habitation. The second theory supposes the six Mosaic days to be so many indefinite periods of time. A third hypothesis would combine these two into one.

In noticing the arguments by which these opinions are defended we cannot enter into details, we can only touch briefly some of the salient points. Now, it is most important to observe at the very outset that, so far as the direct teaching of the Church is concerned, there exists no definition of Pope or Council, to which any of these opinions is in any way opposed. So far, therefore, the opinions are perfectly free. But, it may be said, there are things not expressly defined by Pope or Council, which, nevertheless, Catholics are not at liberty to impugn—for example, when there is a unanimous consensus of Fathers or theologians affirming that such or such is the one true meaning of this or that Scripture text. Here, again, the opinions are perfectly free. For, as the passages cited by Dr. Molloy in his Appendix clearly demonstrate, no such consensus exists. Nay, the texts of S. Augustine and S. Thomas alone are decisive on this point. For both these great doctors, writing on this very part of Scripture, expressly and earnestly caution against maintaining particular interpretations as the interpretations and doctrines of the Catholic Church. We are far from wishing to insinuate that any of the geological theories has any consensus in its favour: we only mean to assert the important fact, that there is no consensus for *any* theory whatever.

But, it may still be urged, are we then at liberty to interpret this or that passage of Scripture at random, merely because the Church has not defined its meaning, and Fathers and theologians are divided or uncertain or silent? Most assuredly not. And if there be any volume in existence, which, in such circumstances, demands to be investigated at once in a pure and humble spirit, and with a constant reference to the principles of true and sound criticism, it is the inspired volume. And this is exactly the line of procedure which Dr. Molloy, in common with the learned men who preceded him in the same track, has adapted. He does not undertake to *prove* any of the geological theories from the Bible, but merely to show that none of these theories are at variance with the sacred text, interpreted according to the canons of exegesis admitted and adopted by all genuine masters of the laws of language; and in this he has, we think, succeeded to perfection.

The opening verses of Genesis bear easily and naturally, without the slightest strain or pressure, the whole incumbent

weight of countless ages, which, according to the first theory, may or must have rolled away before the creation of light, that is, before the dawning of the first day. Nay, to our apprehension, taken in their literal and obvious sense, they seem pretty clearly to signify that there *was* an interval (long or short is noway intimated) between the first creation and the first day.

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth [when thus first created] was waste and empty [plainly chaotic and unformed—how long in no way intimated]; and darkness was upon the face of the deep [still] chaos—no intimation how long]; and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the water [not idly, but effecting something in them—what, in what manner, how long, not intimated]. And [when this state of the globe had existed for a period, how long we are not told] God said, Let there be light," &c. And so begins the first day.

The second theory fits perfectly into the subsequent verses, if it can be shown that the word *day* does not necessarily signify our natural day of twenty-four hours, but may mean an indefinite period: morning and evening being the commencement and closing of the period. This is clearly proved, by a copious array of illustrations, from the usage of Scripture; and might, we suppose, be proved from the usage of all languages. The history of the creation of the world is, indeed, in its language, simplicity itself; but the reader, the Christian reader at least, needs not the direction of Longinus* to feel the stupendous grandeur of the images which in such quick succession it passes before his mind. We cannot even faintly realize to ourselves the splendour of that vision of days, which God revealed to the inward eye of the inspired writer. But, as the word *day* is perfectly capable of such a sense, it seems to us a singularly beautiful mode of expressing the lapse of countless ages in the work of Him, "whose going forth is from the beginning, from the days of eternity."† "For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday, which is past and gone."‡

In fine, we think that the geological theory derives no small degree of likelihood from a consideration of the working of God's ordinary providence in the affairs of this world, not only in the natural order, moral and physical, but also in the supernatural. The facts or phenomena of that providence are so obvious and so universally known, that a few words of suggestion will be quite sufficient to flash the argument in all its completeness before the mind of every reader.

In the first place, we see that, in the natural order, everything

* On the Sublime, sect. ix., § 9.

† Micheas, v. 2.

‡ Psalm lxxxix. 4.

grows up, generally from shapeless and unformed elements, to its destined perfection. So it is with animals, trees, plants. Some have a quicker growth, some a slower; but all grow. So grows the human soul in habits, in intellectual strength, in knowledge of every kind. Nothing is in its beginning complete. It is the same in the supernatural order. On the very day of the great fall, God revealed His decree of mercy to save the world by one to be born of the woman's seed; but the fulness of time did not arrive for more than four thousand years. From Adam to Abraham there is no record of any new revelation, save that of the coming flood made to Noah. For all this long period men were left to the light of natural religion, and such twinkles of the Eden light as the ever-deepening gloom had not utterly quenched. Heaven came nearer to earth in Abraham and the other patriarchs, nearer still in Moses. Then came, but long after, the Psalmist and the Prophets and other inspired men; and the gleams of the still far-off dawn became brighter and broader, until at last burst out the effulgence of perfect day. There is the same law of growth in the supernatural life of the individual man. It is by degrees men are converted from error and sin: it is by degrees the just man advances to that point of holiness, which, in the foreknowledge of God, is to be his highest.*

In the second place, we see that, in the same ordinary providence, God works out His ultimate designs, not immediately, but through the intervention of secondary causes. The full-grown oak is His, and His hands made it, not by an immediate act of omnipotence, but through the operation of created agencies. He sends as His ministers, the four elements of fire, air, earth, and water to work on that small acorn seed; and it takes them a hundred years to rear it up into the "kingly forest tree." So it is with all living things on earth. Man, in his maturity the most perfect of them all, if left to himself in his early years, would be the most helpless and miserable of them all. It is the same, again, in the supernatural order. Faith comes through hearing: grace has its many channels, through which it flows into the souls of men: there are sacraments, preachers, pastors. But it is needless to illustrate further a truth so very evident.

May not, then, this hard shell of earth have had, in like manner, its early age and long periods of growth? And may not the sister elements of fire and air and water have been used by God as His agents in bringing it to its present consistency and form?

* See our number for April, 1869, p. 426.

ART. VI.—MR. TENNYSON'S ARTHURIAN POEMS.

The Holy Grail and Other Poems. By ALFRED TENNYSON, D.C.L., Poet Laureate. London : Strahan & Co. 1869.

THE laurels of the Laureate are oppressively abundant. For his share of glory, though he is not yet very old, he may well say *Vixi satis*. The press is never weary of producing new editions of his poems, none of them very cheap : the mere hummings (so to speak) of his Muse are valued at an incredible price ; if he retaliates on the spiteful attacks of a jealous rival, his rejoinder is not only welcomed, but well paid for. The greatest speeches of the greatest orators are not perfect without a line or two quoted from him. The pencil of perhaps the most variously gifted artist of our time is never more happily employed than in bringing before the bodily eye of multitudes that which the mind's eye of the poet has first seen. If this be not fame, what is ? It is not equal to Tasso's, perhaps, whose verses were familiar to the gondoliers of Venice. Princes appreciate Mr. Tennyson, and statesmen quote him ; but, as to popularity in the largest sense, all that can be said is that our London cabmen (an unmusical race, it must be owned), have not yet got into the habit of singing, " Come into the garden, Maud," though it is an indispensable feature of all miscellaneous concerts.

A substantial part of Mr. Tennyson's fame rests, and will rest, upon the series of poems of which the fabulous King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table are the heroes. They form a consistent, though not a complete whole. They can hardly be said to make up what could be called an *Arthuriad* ; because their general structure is not epical, though they are full of epical passages. Generally speaking, indeed, they are not referable to any definite standard, or capable of being classified distinctly under any one of the recognized orders of poetical composition. Even the " Idylls of the King " are not idyllic, in the previously received sense of the word. The whole series can be best described as forming a sort of metrical romance ; though even that description would be inappropriate, as far as it would seem to indicate any parallel with the poems of Scott or Southey, or any others of a similar character. The treatment of such a subject (though the result shows that Mr. Tennyson did well to choose it) is beset with difficulties. In the first place, King Arthur is

an anachronism. Whether a sovereign of the name ever ruled in Britain, or any part of it, we are not concerned to question ; but it is needless to remark that a real personage of the time at which his reign is fixed would be almost as unlike the Arthur of fabulous romance as Queen Boadicea would be to Queen Victoria. It is probably to the novels of Fenimore Cooper that we should have to look for the nearest imaginable approximation to a series of characters belonging to a period when Britons had not entirely ceased to be (as the name implies) painted men. To surround the wigwags of the only possible Camelot with accessories borrowed from feudal ages and chivalric associations, is nearly, if not quite, as absurd as if the body of Elaine were to be described as borne to its rest by special train on the Astolat and Camelot Junction Railway. The Round Table (if the real Arthur had any such piece of furniture) was as little in a position to find itself the centre of a circle of Lancelots and Geraints and Bediveres, as it was to be the subject of Mr. Douglas Home's manipulations.

But this is not Mr. Tennyson's fault. Three courses (as a matter of course) were open to him. Having chosen King Arthur as his hero, he might have tried to come as nearly as possible to reality in his delineation of the character, with the aid of various correct historical and archæological details. But he would, perhaps, in that case have produced a figure as stiff and ungraceful as those mediæval representations of saints which the late Mr. Pugin strove so hard to popularize amongst us. Again, he might have given us a pure creation of his own fancy, in which case he would have been exposed to the imputation of having given the creature of his brain a name to which it had no right. What he did was to adopt the Arthur of romance, substantially in the form which rhymers and fabulists of the middle ages had given him, but perfected by the poet's own conceptions of what best befitted the kingly and the knightly character, and adorned by the poet's picturesque imagination with all that could best set off such a character, and make it act consistently in the manifold variety of circumstances in which it should be placed. All the incongruous machinery, natural and supernatural, with which he found himself hampered, the fortuitous association of saints and fairies, angels and hobgoblins, Druids and monks, was not in reality of his own choosing. Let us suppose an actor of genius thrown by the force of circumstances into a company of which Mr. Vincent Crummles is the manager. He has to perform the part of Othello, and it is a law of the Crummlesian stage that, in that character, his face must be as black as that of a Christy Minstrel. Useless for him to plead

that a Moor is not necessarily a negro : useless to appeal to the authentic presence of the Moorish embassy that was in London some years ago (at the time, as we remember, of the first Volunteer Review in Hyde Park), whose garb, indeed, was outlandish though not unbecoming, but whose faces were as white and, for the matter of that, as Cockney as any faces in the crowd they gazed upon. What of all that? Shakespeare made Othello a black; Crummles follows that ruling, with corollaries as to costume deduced by himself : and there is nothing more to be said. Such a case seems to us to present something of a parallel to the difficulties of Mr. Tennyson's position.

This volume fills up the order and sequence of the Arthurian poems. The "Coming of Arthur," with which it begins, is the natural prelude. Then come the "Idylls of the King," published several years ago, with which the new poem of "Pelleas and Ettarre" must be grouped. The "Passing of Arthur," incorporating the well-known "Morte d'Arthur," completes the series. A French writer has observed that a book without a preface would be something like a man going out without his hat. There is a good deal of truth in the comparison. A preface is not a matter of much consequence. It is the last thing the author writes, and the last thing any one thinks of reading. It is a purely conventional thing, not required at all for the completeness of the work which it introduces, and it may be in any style. It cannot be said that the "Coming of Arthur" is a mere preface in this sense, but it is certainly very inferior to the other poems. "Leodogran, the King of Cameliard," has an only child, a daughter, for whom he wishes to find a suitable husband. Arthur, who had delivered his territory from the ravages of wild beasts and savage men, offers himself as a suitor. But a mystery hangs over the hero's birth. His mother had been forced to marry her second husband so soon after the death of her first that it was problematical to which of them he belonged ; and scandal, with her usual officiousness, suggested that possibly he was the child of neither. On the other hand, the sentiment of hero-worship assigned to him a mysterious and supernatural origin ; and Leodogran is determined by a dream to favour this view of the case, and disposes of his daughter accordingly. It is needless to say that all this is told in a number of graceful lines. Mr. Tennyson never writes any other, except for a purpose. But we find in them few traces of power. There is great force and vividness in some of the opening lines, describing the desolate state of Cameliard before its deliverance by Arthur :—

And thus the land of Cameliard was waste,
Thick with wet woods, and many a beast therein,
And none or few to scare or chase the beast ;
So that wild dog and wolf and bear, and boar
Came night and day, and rooted in the fields,
And wallow'd in the gardens of the king.
And ever and anon the wolf would steal
The children and devour, but now and then,
Her own brood lost or dead, lent her fierce teat
To human sucklings ; and the children, housed
In her foul den, there at their meat would growl,
And mock their foster-mother on four feet,
Till, straighten'd, they grew up to wolf-like men,
Worse than the wolves. And King Leodogran
Groan'd for the Roman legions here again,
And Cæsar's eagle : then his brother king,
Rience, assail'd him : last a heathen horde,
Reddening the sun with smoke and earth with blood,
And on the spike that split the mother's heart
Spitting the child, brake on him till, amazed,
He knew not whither he should turn for aid.

Nor must we omit to commend to the notice of Irish consolidators the lines :—

And so there grew great tracts of wilderness
Wherein the beast was ever more and more,
But man was less and less.

But the general course of the narrative is monotonously level. It serves, however, fairly enough as a preface to the "Idylls." To us the interest of those fine poems centres around the figures of the pure and heroic Arthur and the guilty and remorseful Guinevere. Not that we are unmoved by the invincible constancy of Enid and the sad destiny of Elaine. A diction of unsurpassed felicity and beauty gives to the simplest incidents in these touching tales a charm that fascinates the fancy and haunts the memory. What, for instance, can be more exquisite in expression than these lines ?—

Then rose Elaine and glided through the fields,
And past beneath the wildly-sculptured gates
Far up the dim rich city to her kin ;
There bode the night : but woke with dawn, and past
Down through the dim rich city to the fields,
Thence to the cave : so day by day she past
In either twilight ghost-like to and fro

Gliding, and every day she tended him,
 And likewise many a night : and Lancelot
 Would, tho' he call'd his wound a little hurt
 Whereof he should be quickly whole, at times
 Brain-feverous in his heat and agony, seem
 Uncourteous, even he : but the meek maid
 Sweetly forbore him ever, being to him
 Meeker than any child to a rough nurse,
 Milder than any mother to a sick child,
 And never woman yet, since man's first fall,
 Did kindlier unto man, but her deep love
 Upbore her ; till the hermit, skill'd in all
 The simples and the science of that time,
 Told him that her fine care had saved his life.
 And the sick man forgot her simple blush,
 Would call her friend and sister, sweet Elaine,
 Would listen for her coming and regret
 Her parting step, and held her tenderly,
 And loved her with all love except the love
 Of man and woman when they love their best,
 Closest and sweetest, and had died the death
 In any knightly fashion for her sake.
 And peradventure had he seen her first
 She might have made this and that other world
 Another world for the sick man ; but now
 The shackles of an old love straiten'd him,
 His honour rooted in dishonour stood,
 And faith unfaithful kept him falsely true.

We do not care to linger in the company of wily Vivien or haughty Ettarre—representatives of the Camelotian *demi-monde*. The story of Vivien and Merlin points the same moral as the authentic history of Samson and Dalila ; but it was not, therefore, necessary to tell it, and it is told, we think, a little too plainly. It is rather a matter of surprise to us that, out of the five women of the Arthurian period with whom the poet occupies himself, three are of damaged reputation. This seems to us too large a proportion, whether regard be had to the possible conditions of society then, or to its conceivable conditions in a poetical point of view. In the former case, the Britons of the time would have made short work of such offenders. In the latter case, Mr. Tennyson might have paid his countrywomen a better compliment than to suppose that they would be particularly interested in such types of female character. But he has only fallen in with a fashion which has unhappily gained much ground ; and we fear it is too late to wish that our fictionists in prose and verse would

leave that style of heroine, with or without camellias, at the other side of Dover Straits. These remarks, however, are not intended to apply to the character of Guinevere, as the poet has drawn and developed it. In that, and indeed in the general tone of these poems, there breathes a spirit of high and, we might say, of Catholic morality. Sin is not depicted in false and seductive colours. It is the blight that withers what would else have been lovely and admirable. It is the taint that diffuses the poison of death through a frame seeming full of life and vigour. We are never in danger of forgetting the fall of Lancelot, amid all his chivalrous characteristics. We are never permitted to lose sight of Guinevere's guilt, though she is presented to us in all the charms of womanly grace and queenly dignity. In the scene at the Convent of Almesbury, where Arthur sees her for the last time, there is in that "all through thee!" the summing-up of the fatal indictment in which the worth and purity of his Court as he designed it, and as it was before he wedded her, is contrasted with what it afterwards became. His tone is full of pity and forbearance, but he spares her no reproach that could awaken conscience and turn her to repentance. And what can be truer to nature, as affected by the influences of our holy faith, than the spirit of her contrite appeal to the sisterhood?—

So let me, if you do not shudder at me,
Nor shun to call me sister, dwell with you ;
Wear black and white, and be a nun like you ;
Fast with your fasts, not feasting with your feasts ;
Grieve with your griefs, not grieving at your joys,
But not rejoicing ; mingle with your rites ;
Pray and be pray'd for ; lie before your shrines ;
Do each low office of your holy house ;
Walk your dim cloister, and distribute dole
To poor sick people, richer in His eyes
Who ransom'd us, and haler too than I ;
And treat their loathsome hurts and heal mine own ;
And so wear out in almsdeed and in prayer
The sombre close of that voluptuous day
Which wrought the ruin of my lord the King.

The characters of the "Idylls" are now so well known that gentlemen of the turf have for some time been calling their racehorses after them, and we should seem to be assuming in our readers a degree of ignorance, the mere suspicion of which would be offensive, if we were to dwell upon them longer. The volume now before us, however, though to most of those who

have leisure and inclination to cultivate English literature it has ceased to be a novelty, demands a fuller notice at our hands. The poem of the "Holy Grail" is its principal feature, and the chief one that enters into our present design. Passing by questions of etymology, it is sufficient to explain that the Holy Grail is the cup used by Our Lord at the Last Supper, which, according to the legend, was brought by S. Joseph of Arimathæa to Glastonbury, where for a season it was the cause of many miraculous blessings, but whence when the times grew evil it was caught away to heaven. The story of the expeditions undertaken in quest of it by the Knights of the Round Table is told by one of them, Sir Percivale, called the Pure, who had quitted the court for the cloister, to his fellow monk, Ambrosius. The teller of the tale, its hearer, and all the personages introduced into it are well and distinctly drawn. The commonplace qualities of the worthy Ambrosius serve as a foil to the wonderful adventures of the Knights. He is most at home among the humble neighbours of the monastery, the depositary of their secrets, the confidant of their cares; it is his business, as he says of himself, to

Delight myself with gossip and old wives,
And ills and aches, and teething, lyings-in,
And mirthful sayings, children of the place,
That have no meaning half a league away :
Or lulling random squabbles when they rise,
Chafferings and chatterings at the market-cross,
Rejoice, small man, in this small world of mine,
Yea, even in their hens and in their eggs——

and the marvellous incidents of the Quest excite his constant amazement. The vision of the Grail was vouchsafed to Sir Percivale's sister, a holy nun, whom long years of prayer and penance had purified from stains of no deep dye, and fitted for such a revelation. It was heralded by strains of an unearthly music :—

" And then
Stream'd through my cell a cold and silver beam,
And down the long beam stole the Holy Grail,
Rose-red with beatings in it, as if alive,
Till all the white walls of my cell were dyed
With rosy colours leaping on the wall ;
And then the music faded, and the Grail,
Pass'd, and the beam decay'd, and from the walls
The rosy quiverings died into the night.

In obedience to her exhortations the knights enter on a

course of prayer and fasting, in the hope that the vision may be granted to them also. In consequence of this it is partially and for a moment revealed to them, and the sight so inflames their desire to see it again and more fully that several take a vow to journey in search of it for a year and a day. All this had happened in the King's absence, and, on his return, he rebukes their precipitancy in entering on an enterprise for which few of them were fitted, and which would divert their energies from grave and urgent service at home. After a great tourney held at the King's desire before the knights set out, at which Galahad and Percivale especially distinguished themselves, the Quest begins. Sir Percivale relates his own adventures first: how that his heart was elate with pride at the thought of his recent prowess in the lists, and the confident expectation of success in his enterprise; how that, at different stages of his journey, he was mocked by bright phantoms, now of pleasant and refreshing lawns, now of scenes of domestic peace, again of the dazzling presence of a knight in golden armour set all round with jewels, lastly of a city on a hill, in which there was but one inhabitant, a man of exceeding age; how that they all at the first touch turned to dust, and left him in dejection, till he begins to fear that the vision of the Grail, even should he find it, would be fleeting and unreal as the rest. At last he comes to a chapel, where he meets with a holy hermit, who tells him the cause of his failure:—

O son, thou hast not true humility,
The highest virtue, mother of them all;
For when the Lord of all things made Himself
Naked of glory for His mortal change,
"Take thou my robe," she said, "for all is Thine,"
And all her form shone forth with sudden light,
So that the angels were amazed, and she
Follow'd Him down, and like a flying star
Led on the gray-hair'd wisdom of the East;
But her thou hast not known: for what is this
Thou thoughtest of thy prowess and thy sins?
Thou hast not lost thyself to save thyself
As Galahad.

Suddenly Galahad himself comes in. The Knights join in worship, and, "at the Sacring of the Mass," while Percivale sees only the holy elements, the Grail appears to Galahad, who also sees (in a manner, however, somewhat savouring of the Impanation heresy) the Presence itself. He recounts that, for his part, the Holy Grail had accompanied him throughout his journey, seen faintly by day, but ever clearly visible at night

with a blood-red glow. In the strength of its companionship he has everywhere shattered evil customs, conquered pagan realms, and overthrown hostile hordes; but the time is at hand when he is to pass away from earth to the "spiritual city," there to be crowned king. He promises, however, that when he departs Percivale shall see the vision too. Immediately follows the description of Galahad's ascent to the spiritual city, and Percivale's sight of the Grail, which is picturesque and striking, but which would be better in its way if the word "and" did not occur twenty-four times in fifty-one lines, in nine of which it begins a line. Such signs of weakness occur too often in this volume, and almost suggest the caution, *Solve senescentem*.

The next adventure told is that of Sir Bors, the kinsman and devoted friend of Sir Lancelot :—

He had been well content
Not to have seen, so Lancelot might have seen,
The Holy Cup of healing; and, indeed,
Being so clouded with his grief and love,
Small heart was his after the Holy Quest :
If God would send the vision, well : if not,
The Quest and he were in the hands of Heaven.

This meritorious spirit of resignation and indifference is rewarded. Riding through a wild and remote part of the kingdom, he falls among a party of Druids. In the religious controversy in which they engage with him, he lets fall some words with which their people are incensed. He is seized, plunged into a cell of great piled stones, and left lying there in bonds, till by miracle one of the huge stones is loosed from its place, leaving a gap, through which he sees the seven tutelary stars of Arthur's Table, and then, beyond his hopes, the Holy Grail itself. Afterwards a Christian maid, of kin to his heathen persecutors, secretly enters, looses, and lets him go. Of the other principal knights, Sir Gawain, the king's nephew, light and voluptuous, soon finds his vow too weighty for him; is quite pleased with the advice of his spiritual director that the Quest was not for him; having got which advice (which, like those who go for a dispensation at the beginning of Lent, was all his business with the holy man), he amuses himself according to his taste until the year and day are at an end. Sir Lancelot's story is treated with great judgment and skill. The king asks him to tell his adventures; not doubting of his success, as one whom he deemed the very flower of his chivalry. The task is a painful one for Lancelot. Beginning with a groan of anguish, he tells that,

from the outset, his course was hindered by a sin of such a kind that it had grown into and twined itself round all that was best in his nature; that, indeed, he had taken the vow only in the hope that the sight or touch of the Holy Grail might free him from this fatal sin; but that a most holy saint, whom he consulted, had told him with tears that, if he could not first rid himself of the sin, the Quest was vain. This thought drives him mad; and it is left in doubt whether what he describes was anything more than the dream of a dis-tempered mind. The description itself, however, is one of the best parts of the poem. These lines are in the author's most perfect manner:—

Seven days I drove along the dreary deep,
And with me drove the moon and all the stars;
And the wind fell, and on the seventh night
I heard the shingle grinding in the surge,
And felt the boat shock earth, and looking up,
Behold, the enchanted towers of Carbonek,
A castle like a rock upon a rock,
With chasm-like portals open to the sea,
And steps that met the breaker! There was none
Stood near it but a lion on each side
That kept the entry, and the moon was full.

The rest of the passage is too long to quote, but it is nearly all of the same merit. There is a touch of quiet satire in making the frivolous Gawain come in, after Lancelot's tale, with a compliment to his own good sense in having kept out of such a driftless enterprise, which he ends with a superfluous protest that the ecstasies of holy virgins shall not be permitted to have any influence on his future conduct. Of course he is rebuked by the king, who moralises on the whole event, and closes with a mysterious allusion to his own coming fate.

It will be seen, even from our rapid summary, that the story of the "Holy Grail" is well designed and skilfully constructed. If its poetical excellence were even less, the conception and action of the characters and the method of the narrative would make it be read with interest. We have already intimated our disinclination to deal with the poem of "Pelleas and Ettarre," which immediately follows in this volume. As a piece of composition, it is undeniably beautiful: the narrative is lively and the language exquisite; indelicate things are delicately veiled; but the subject does not please us. We grudge to see that wealth of jewelry scattered on such a worthless scrap of flesh.

The "Passing of Arthur" completes the series. It embodies, as we have before remarked, the poet's earlier work,

entitled the "Morte d'Arthur." We must say that the dove-tailing might be more deftly done ; but we cannot agree with the opinion expressed by some critics that the new parts of the poem are not worthy of the old. There is more of care and finish, undoubtedly, in the lines with which we have been long familiar, but the description now given us of Arthur's last battle on the sands of Lyonesse is written with the power of a master, and leaves nothing to desire in method, movement, or colouring. The extract is rather long, but no one will dislike to read it, and we shall make no more :—

Nor ever yet had Arthur fought a fight
 Like this last, dim, weird battle of the west.
 A death-white mist slept over sand and sea :
 Whereof the chill, to him who breathed it, drew
 Down with his blood, till all his heart was cold
 With formless fear ; and e'en on Arthur fell
 Confusion, since he saw not whom he fought,
 For friend and foe were shadows in the mist,
 And friend slew friend not knowing whom he slew ;
 And some had visions out of golden youth,
 And some beheld the faces of old ghosts
 Look in upon the battle ; and in the mist
 Was many a noble deed, many a base,
 And chance and craft and strength in single fights,
 And ever and anon with host to host
 Shocks, and the splintering spear, the hard mail hewn,
 Shield-breakings, and the clash of brands, the crash
 Of battleaxes on shatter'd helms, and shrieks
 After the Christ, of those who falling down
 Look'd up for heaven, and only saw the mist ;
 And shouts of heathen and the traitor knights,
 Oaths, insult, filth, and monstrous blasphemies,
 Sweat, writhings, anguish, labouring of the lungs
 In that close mist, and cryings for the light,
 Moans of the dying, and voices of the dead.

Last, as by some one deathbed after wail
 Of suffering, silence follows, or thro' death
 Or deathlike swoon, thus over all that shore,
 Save for some whisper of the seething seas,
 A dead hush fell ; but when the dolorous day
 Grew drearier toward twilight falling, came
 A bitter wind, clear from the north, and blew
 The mist aside, and with that wind the tide
 Rose, and the pale king glanced across the field
 Of battle : but no man was moving there ;
 Nor any cry of Christian heard thereon,
 Nor yet of heathen ; only the wan wave

Brake in among dead faces, to and fro
Swaying the helpless hands, and up and down
Tumbling the hollow helmets, of the fallen,
And shiver'd brands that once had fought with Rome,
And rolling far along the gloomy shores
The voice of days of old and days to be.

No one better illustrates than Mr. Tennyson the truth of the venerable maxim that "art is long." The early effusions of his muse, which were what enthusiastic young ladies call "sweetly pretty," sometimes bordered on the namby-pamby, and found a fit receptacle and shrine in those "Books of Beauty" which were a feature of the period. His sweetness, indeed, has never failed; but it was then rather cloying—the honey, possibly, of Hymettus or of Hybla, but with a flavour much less of thyme than of lavender. Between "Lilian" and "Maud" there lies an interval of progressive improvement far exceeding any proportion in the interval of time; and the "Lady of Shalott" revived in "Elaine" is almost as different as a lay figure from a living person. Sweet as his first notes were, they were worthier of the lute that echoes in a lady's bower than of the lyre that stirs into life and action the souls of men. But in his later poems, besides the exquisite diction which is their unfailing charm, there are numberless fine thoughts and striking descriptions; words that electrify and phrases that photograph; a rapid, bounding movement, and a vital and vivid energy; a force of expression which transfers, with the clearness and sharpness and indelibility of a die, the writer's idea to the reader's mind. We do not deny, then, that Mr. Tennyson's popularity is well founded as well as fully established. No doubt, the verses of Tasso were familiar to patrician lips before they found their way to the mouths of the Venetian people. If those classes among ourselves which plume themselves as the higher, had not such a deplorably bad taste for "chickaleary" lyrics and the slang of stables and streets; if they set a good example to those inferiors whose bad example they are now so astonishingly eager to imitate; it is not impossible that the wonderfully perfect English and ever-musical verse of the Poet Laureate would come in time to have that influence over all English-speaking men which it has evidently gained among the cultured and well-educated.

ART. VII.—THE MINISTERIAL EDUCATION BILL.

A Bill to Provide for Public Elementary Education in England and Wales.
Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed.

THURSDAY, February 17, 1870, will assuredly be an era of immense importance in the history of England. On that day Mr. Forster, as Vice-President of the Council, proposed and explained in the House of Commons a Bill the object of which is to provide that every child in England and Wales shall henceforth receive elementary education ; and great as had been up to that very moment the differences of opinion upon the subject, that Bill was received by both the great parties, in a manner which makes it morally certain that before the end of the Session its main provisions at least will become law. That a Bill professing to be a permanent settlement of so vast, so important, and so much disputed a subject, should have been received as it has hitherto been by Parliament and by the country at large, is in itself one of the most extraordinary triumphs which any British Administration ever attained ; and no man whose memory extends back for forty years, or even less, can fail to feel it as the strongest possible illustration of the fact, that England, in the life of the present generation, has passed through a most real, although by the blessing of God, a silent and bloodless revolution. To imagine how such a measure would have been received, say before 1830, would be impossible, because no one can really form the idea of any minister proposing it. We need hardly say, that there are many things in the change which we deplore ; but we wish our readers to present to their minds, not merely the things which we must regret, but the whole of the revolution of which they are part ; because, on the whole, the consideration is calculated to make them thank God and take courage. Much as there is to regret, much to oppose, in 1870, would we on the whole change it for 1820 ?

Our readers must forgive us if, in shortly stating the more important details of the Government measure, we repeat what is now familiar to them all ; for the recollection of such details soon becomes dim and indistinct even in the minds of those who have felt the keenest interest in them ; and we suspect that those whose knowledge on the subject is now most accurate will, before very long, be glad to have them in a form on which they can look back.

The Bill proposes, then, to enact, that a "public elementary school" shall henceforth be provided (where it does not already exist) for every poor child in England and Wales. The conditions of such a school are laid down as three. 1. That the secular teaching shall attain the standard required by the Committee of Council on Education. 2. That the school shall be subject to the visits and examination of the Queen's Inspectors; the rule being abandoned which bound particular schools (as, for instance, Catholic schools and those of the Established Church) to receive only inspectors of the same religion with their managers. 3. That "no scholar shall be required, as a condition of being admitted into or enjoying all the benefits of the school, to attend or abstain from attending any Sunday school, or any place of religious worship, or to learn any such catechism or religious formulary, or to be present at any such lesson, or instruction, or observance as may have been objected to on religious grounds by the parent of the child, or by its guardian or other person who is liable to maintain or has the actual custody of it, such objection having been expressed in writing to the manager or principal teacher of the school."

Next, the Bill divides England and Wales into school districts, which, in the country, are to be the same as the parishes relieving their own poor, unless the Educational Department shall unite two or more into one district. In places having municipal corporations the school district will be the same as the borough; in London the districts will be the same as the existing union school districts, where these exist, and in other cases the same as the district administered by a vestry. As soon as the Act is passed, the Educational Department is to take steps (prescribed by the Bill) to obtain a report upon each district, certifying whether the existing means of elementary education are or are not deficient. In calculating this, allowance is to be made for all schools which allow the necessary information to be obtained, whether or not they have hitherto been visited by the Queen's Inspectors and assisted by a Government grant.

With those districts in which the supply of elementary education is reported to be adequate, the new system is not to interfere, except that the three conditions already detailed are to be necessary before any school will be treated as a public school and left in possession. In all others, in which it is announced to be insufficient, a year is to be allowed from the date of such public announcement, in which voluntary exertions may, if they can, supply the deficiency. If at the end of the year it is still unsupplied, the Education Department may order a "school board" to be appointed. This is to consist of either

three, six, nine, or twelve persons, among whom, as far as appears, women may be appointed, and of whom one-third is to go out of office each year, being capable of re-election. The appointment is to be made, in boroughs by the town council; elsewhere by the vestry, select or otherwise as the case may be. This board is, within twelve months, "to provide such public school accommodation as is necessary." This they may do, either by providing new schools, to be managed either by themselves or by a board of managers which they are authorized to appoint; or, if they prefer it, by granting assistance to existing "public elementary schools"; but in this last case they must give it on "equal terms to all such schools upon conditions to be approved by the Educational Department"; or they may adopt both these plans. With regard to schools founded by themselves, they are to have the same powers as other school managers, and may either connect them with any religion they select, or cause them to be wholly secular,—it being of course open to parents to remove their children from any teaching, whether religious or irreligious, to which they object on religious grounds.

The school boards are to be strictly under the Educational Department, and if any of them fail to do what is required, or otherwise infringes the law, it may be superseded by the Department, which will then perform all acts which the board might perform.

The expenses of the school boards are to be defrayed from the poor-rate, but this charge must not exceed the amount of a rate of threepence in the pound. The money thus paid out of the rate is to entitle the school to grants from the Parliamentary vote in the same proportion as if it was maintained at the same expense by voluntary subscriptions. The children are to pay fees, to be fixed by the school board with the consent of the Department, but free schools may be established in certain exceptional cases, and the board may also pay these fees for parents whom they think incapable of paying. In this last case they are forbidden to make it a condition that the child should attend any particular school. The board may also establish or contribute towards "industrial schools."

Lastly, the board, with the approval of the Educational Department, may make bye-laws, to be approved by the Queen in Council (unless an address against them has been presented by either House of Parliament), and by these bye-laws it may impose a fine, not exceeding five shillings, on parents not sending to school any child between five and twelve years, unless it can be shown that it is receiving sufficient instruction elsewhere, or that it is kept away by sickness or other un-

avoidable cause, or that there is no public elementary school within a mile of its dwelling.

Such is the plan which was so warmly received by both the great parties in the House, that the "Times" declared the next day "it would undoubtedly secure the approbation of Parliament," and echoed Sir J. Pakington's declaration that the only thing to be regretted was, that Mr. Forster had not made his speech introducing it as the responsible Minister of Public Instruction. One day later the "Spectator" added, "It was difficult to say by which side of the House Mr. Forster was most heartily cheered. The pillars of the League vied with the pillars of the Union in expressing their satisfaction. When he sat down the cheering came from all parts of the House. It was felt that the problem had been solved."

Three days afterwards the applause began to be less unanimous, but the objections came only from the advocates of purely secular education. The "Guardian" then said: "The League has published a manifesto, accepting the Bill, if we mistake not, as a whole, dwelling with pleasure on its exceptional provisions, and indicating a desire to change them, if possible, into normal and prominent features." For itself, it called on "the Church, through the National Society, and Churchmen in their individual capacities and spheres, to give it general support." The organs of the Ritualistic party also supported it quite as decidedly. These extracts give a fair account of what has really happened as yet. From the first moment both parties seemed equally pleased; but the "extreme left" is now expressing dissatisfaction, and calling out for serious changes—that the proposed new schools should be purely secular—that they should be free—and that compulsion should be universal instead of exceptional.

The measure thus received is not of course one which Catholics would have chosen if the field were clear. In fact, none which was really such could have been carried, or, indeed, seriously proposed, in any country in which Protestant prejudice is as strong as it is in England. Accordingly, no one can be surprised that a very influential body of priests and laymen, who assembled by the invitation of Lord Howard of Glossop, as Chairman of the Poor School Committee, resolved, that "the Bill, if it becomes law in its present form, will be dangerous to the faith and religion of the poorer Catholics, from their number and position unable to help themselves, and that it is the duty of Catholics to make every effort to have improvements introduced into it." They also suggested a form of petition on the subject. The fact is that, so far as any Catholic has been willing to accept the Bill, it has not

been because it puts Catholics, with regard to education, on an equal footing with men of other religions;—but because he despairs of the passing of any education measure which would really have that effect, and hopes that the present Bill, if amended in some important particulars and if fairly administered, will at least produce more good than harm. The Catholic religion has so uniformly been made the one exception to the rule that all forms of Christianity are to receive from Government equal treatment, that we are apt to submit without resistance to a degree of inequality, which would raise into furious resistance even the most obscure and smallest of the Protestant sects. What can be a more striking illustration of this than the fact that, although the Catholics are by far the poorest class in England, their schools were systematically excluded from all share in the Parliamentary grant for about fifteen years after it had been extended to those of every Protestant sect? Beyond a doubt, if Government really intends to carry out fairly the principle of its own Bill, by giving to denominational schools, supported by private exertions with the aid of Government grants, a fair chance of providing for the education of the poor, before it authorizes the maintenance of secular schools by local rates, it will be ready, during the next two years, to extend to Catholic schools a very large amount of exceptional assistance beyond that given to other schools, in order to meet the exceptional difficulties by which (without any fault of their own) Catholics are surrounded. It will also make the fullest provision to secure to them every facility for the establishment of Catholic schools, wherever there is any Catholic population, even after the new system shall have come into operation.*

* Since this was written, a letter, published by T. W. Allies, has stated so forcibly and temperately the exceptional claims of Catholic schools to immediate consideration and support from Government, that although our readers can hardly fail already to have made themselves masters of it, our discussion of the subject for permanent use would be imperfect if we did not put it on record.

SIR,—The great exodus of the Irish nation in the last fifty years, and more especially in the twenty-three which have succeeded the famine, cast on the shores of America some millions, but it likewise brought to Great Britain a very great number; how many, no one can say with certainty; but I believe I am far within the mark when I assume that we have among us more than a million of Irish, who have come here to get the subsistence which their native land did not afford them. Every one who reflects a moment will see that this fact constitutes for us Catholics an entirely exceptional position in the matter of primary education. It is allowed on all hands that, in the last twenty years, all the great religious bodies in this country, the Established Church, the Wesleyans, the other Dissenters, and

We must therefore exert ourselves to the utmost to obtain substantial improvements in the Bill. The one thing which

the Catholics, have made great efforts, involving large sacrifices on the part of individuals, in behalf of primary education. Mr. Forster at the beginning of his speech gratefully and gracefully records the fact. But I wish to point out an incident in it which, so far as I am aware of, no speaker in Parliament has dwelt upon. The Established Church, in the task of providing primary education, has to deal here and there with large masses of poor; but these poor are everywhere of its own kith and kin, the result of a highly advanced civilization, and counterbalanced, moreover, with the greatest number of persons of independent fortune, with the largest amount of amassed riches which any country has ever possessed. A zealous clergyman, minded to build schools, has but to make a case of real destitution known, and he is sure to get contributors. Again, Wesleyans and Dissenters have to deal mainly with a well-to-do middle class. Poverty to them is certainly not a real hindrance in the work of educating that portion of the labouring classes which belongs to them. But the poor classes with which our British Catholics have had to deal, the million I mentioned about, were not counterbalanced and intermixed with the same amount of rich as in the three cases just cited; of the Upper Ten Thousand but a fragment falls to our share; of a practically exhaustless middle class with independent incomes, on whom to call for works of charity, we possess few; while it was the very need of daily bread which led the million just cited to come among us, and their poverty—their hard struggle for life, which no man with any howels of compassion in him can think of without the strongest sympathy—the result itself of English misrule in Ireland, and part of the gigantic English wrong, has ever formed, and forms now, our great educational difficulty. All honour be given to those, whether Anglicans, Wesleyans, other Dissenters, or Catholics, who, in the last thirty years, have striven to lessen the amount of ignorance, and to provide for those engaged in manual labour the bread of knowledge, which starving minds need as much as starving bodies their proper bread; but let justice also be done as to the conditions in which this educational race has been gone through. The Catholics have been as men clothed in copes of lead, or with plate-armour an inch thick, and shod with sabots, matched to run against men in light flannel jackets and trousers, with cricket shoes. Such having been the conditions of the race, if we have more children, *in proportion* uneducated, than the other three religious bodies, the fact, I conceive, so far from being a cause of shame to us, constitutes the strongest possible claim for an exceptionally kind treatment of us. We have been called upon to provide education for thousands upon thousands of poor children in great cities—London, Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Newcastle, &c.—unconnected, in too many instances, by blood or by religion with any rich or even well-to-do people. One of the Privy Council's rules in making a building grant is that it shall not exceed "the total amount voluntarily contributed by proprietors, residents, or employers of labour in the parish where the school is situated, or within a radius of four miles from the schools." As applied to Anglicans and Dissenters, this was a fair rule, as giving an equitable test of whether the school was wanted. But does it not sound like bitter mockery of the poor priest, who has many hundred children to educate, but not a proprietor, not a resident *contributable*, not an employer of labour in the district prescribed, and who has to travel over England and Ireland to find contributors, and then to evade the rule by presenting their gifts as a contribution from himself on his church's altar. This one fact, of continual recurrence, is more than

compels us on the whole to support it is, that so far from having been inspired by hostility to what is called in England

sufficient to show how entirely exceptional our educational position has been and is.

I now proceed to my second point, which is—How does Mr. Forster's Bill propose to treat us for the future? It professes to continue denominational schools, as at present existing, to extend them within a certain time, and then if need be, to supplement them with board-governed and rate-paid schools. Now, what is the aid which it proposes to give to denominational schools on the one hand, and to board schools on the other, first as to building, and then as to maintenance?

As to building new schools, the aid which since the Revised Code has been given by the Privy Council, after satisfying all its very strict conditions and limitations, amounts to £1 per child to be accommodated, and as the expense of building amounts to at least £3 10s. a head, the Privy Council aid is somewhat more than one-fourth. But this grant cannot be paid unless it be certified that its payment will discharge every claim remaining on the building. It prohibits, therefore, all debt or raising money by mortgage. It is intended still to continue this amount of aid; but it would not be exceeded, nor its conditions relaxed, in the most destitute case conceivable, that is, to supply schooling for many hundred children, where there was not a single resident proprietor or employer of labour. In such a case the applicant must supply three-fourths of the whole cost, must incur no debt, must build on a freehold, or, at least, a long leasehold, and, moreover, to obtain this aid, must practise the pious fraud above mentioned, which, I am sure, in this case, a judging angel will weep over and efface. This is what the Bill offers to us, Catholics, as a building grant, in order to bring into our schools the destitute children of the million mentioned above within a year after it passes into law. But, if this be not done, the Bill, in clauses 46-50, provides for erecting board-governed schools, in which the whole cost of construction shall be raised either by grant from Government or by a rate. A "school fund" is created, and, clause 47, "any sum required to meet any deficiency in the school fund, whether for satisfying past or future liabilities, shall be paid by the rating authority out of the local rate," and, clause 50, "where a School Board incur any expense in providing or enlarging a school-house, they may with the consent of the Education Department, spread the payment over several years, not exceeding thirty, and may, for that purpose, borrow money on the security of the school fund, and may charge that fund and the local rate with the payment of the principal and interest due in respect of the loan."

We have then for building new denominational schools, to be supplied within a year, a grant of one-fourth, with very strict limitations, and no debt to be incurred; and for building the proposed board schools, a school fund created, to be paid by a rate, which shall meet any deficiency whether for satisfying past or future liabilities. A cope of lead for the denominational school; a pair of wings which will carry anybody, however weighted, for the board school, which moreover is to be fitted up with all the best educational apparatus, including a religious or an irreligious teaching according to the choice of the town councillors, or vestry, who appoint its managers.

So much for the building aid in the two cases: for the annual support, the denominational school may continue to obtain from the Privy Council that one-third, or thereabout, which is given at present; the rest it must obtain from school pence or private subscriptions. As to the board school, it need not be under the smallest anxiety, its happy and careless existence is secured

"Denominational Education" (*i. e.*, the system under which children, whose education is assisted by a grant from the public revenue, are taught the religion professed by their parents as an essential part of their education) has really been devised in consequence of Mr. Gladstone's desire to preserve it as far as possible. But for this, it is pretty certain that an educational bill, drawn up by a Liberal Administration, would in the main have embodied the scheme of the Birmingham Education League, the chief features of which are, purely secular schools, supported by rates, and to which parents should be compelled to send their children. So far, therefore, we must be thankful

for ever. "The expenses of the School Board under this Act shall be paid out of a fund called the school fund. There shall be carried to the school fund all moneys received as fees from scholars, or out of moneys provided by Parliament, or raised by way of loan." Clause 46 and clause 47, "any sum required to meet any deficiency in the school fund, whether for satisfying past or future liabilities, shall be paid by the rating authority out of the local rate."

Now put together No. 1 and 2.

We have to supply primary education for 150,000 children, not the natural growth of our own poor, not counterbalanced by rich men in abundance, nay, by such a multitude possessing amassed riches, living in independence, and such wealth arising from commerce, as in their conjunction have never before been witnessed, but for 150,000 children of a class living in such a country, but bearing all its burdens, and not sharing its compensations: a class whom these rich consider aliens in blood and in creed; a class truly, and most emphatically, *magnas inter opes inops*. And to help us in this the State offers us as a contribution a fourth towards building and a third towards maintenance, under very strict conditions. But the State adds, if all this be not completed in a year's time, I will come with a drag-net, such as I have never enabled you to use, but which I will make for myself, and I will sweep your children by thousands out of the by-streets, alleys, and courts of the vast cities which my commerce has created, and where they have taken refuge; and I will place them in schools, for the whole building and maintenance of which I will provide by an unfailing fund out of the rates which you will pay in proportion, and wherein they shall be taught either no religion at all, or such a religion as the managers may choose. These managers, however, will be chosen by a body, which will never elect a Catholic among them; and the religion which they will sanction to be taught in these schools is one which, whatever else it will be, will certainly be in deadly opposition to that faith which the parents of these poor children brought to my shores, and which they account their greatest, nay, their only blessing.

Is this, may I ask, the justice which the Ireland that is in England has to expect from that statesman the glory of whose life we thought it would be to redress the wrongs of the most wronged people on earth, to overthrow the most gigantic iniquity, and to unite England and Ireland in a peace based upon equal treatment, cemented by the Irishman's conviction that England would treat the person, the property, and the religion of the Irish as it would treat all these if they were English?—I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

March 7, 1870.

T. W. ALLIES.

that the Bill is no worse than it is. The principle of the present Bill is to maintain the educational system which is already in operation (that of denominational schools, supported by voluntary contributions, supplemented by a Government grant), and, as far as may be, to encourage its extension; not to encourage any rival system where this is able to provide sufficient means of education for the whole people; but to oblige every district in which it is found insufficient to maintain, by rates, schools sufficient to supply the deficiency, leaving to the representatives of the ratepayers in every such district the absolute liberty to determine the character of the new schools as they will.

It would be easy to suggest a Bill founded on better principles than these; but we much doubt whether such a Bill, even if backed by all the strength of Mr. Gladstone's Administration, would have overcome the opposition it would have excited. Be that as it may, as things now stand it is beyond the compass of possibility that the Bill now before the House, after having been proposed and received as it has, should be rejected in favour of one more favourable to denominational education. The only danger by which it is seriously threatened, is lest the Government should be compelled to substitute for it one more conformable to the demands of the "League." Under these circumstances we should consider it a national calamity if it should not pass the second reading. Delay, we doubt not, would lead to the passing of an Act founded upon principles far more dangerous; very probably of one under which a system more or less like that of the common schools, the curse of the United States, might be established in England.

No Catholic of course could even thus far accept the Bill, without seriously anxious thoughts for the future. If any one practical lesson is taught, both by history and personal experience, it is, that men, even the ablest and most keen-sighted, are unable to do more than guess very vaguely and uncertainly at the course of future events. How then can we accept, without misgivings, a measure which, for good or evil, must exert a most important influence upon the whole future of our country; and not merely upon its material welfare but upon the moral and religious character of millions of our countrymen for generations to come? For, whatever we may hope, we are compelled to acknowledge that its working must be at the very utmost the subject of an uncertain guess.

Mr. Forster hopes that, if his Bill passes, the town councils and vestries, whose past proceedings have satisfied no one, may rise to a new level of character under the sense of a new responsibility. It is much to be hoped. But suppose they do not?

Again, many able men expect that the practical working of the Bill will be that the new school boards will generally assist the existing (denominational) schools out of the rate, rather than found new ones. We agree that it seems most probable; but can any one think it certain? Experience will soon decide these and many other questions. Unfortunately, there is small chance of our being able to make use of that experience for our future guidance, because the step which the British Government is now taking is in its nature one of those which, once taken, can hardly be retraced, let the consequences be what they may.

The real question is whether the Bill will perpetuate and make more efficient the system of Denominational Education, or whether, on the other hand, it will supersede it. We are, on the whole, hopeful: first, because, as we have already said, it is evidently intended by its authors to preserve it; next, because we think it most likely that that intention will be fulfilled: unless, indeed, the advocates and supporters of religious education should remit their exertions—a supposition which we will not make.

And thus only, we are well assured, can its working with regard to Catholic children be either safe or just. As to any “conscience-clause” or other regulation by which it is imagined that Protestant schools (whether belonging to any Protestant sect or avowedly secular) may be made safe for them, we are certain that, however well-intentioned, they are wholly illusive. Our position in this matter is quite different from that of any Protestant sect. For them, a conscience-clause may, we are inclined to think, be a real security; for us it is none. This is the instinctive feeling of Catholics; and the more closely the subject is examined, the more does it appear to be supported by the strongest reasons. First, whatever differences may exist among Protestant sects, their members themselves openly declare that those differences touch no vital point; that they are, as Dr. Chalmers expresses it, “the *nugæ triviales*, if not the *nugæ difficiles* of doctrine and government, the caprices and whimsical peculiarities in which, in this land of perfect toleration, men have chosen to disport themselves.”*

With controversies upon such points no sensible man would wish to trouble poor children between five and twelve years; and hence what is commonly said is really true, that the question whether the child of a Wesleyan or a Baptist shall attend a school managed and taught by Independents or Episcopalians, is rather a point of honour affecting the ministers

* Lectures on Church Establishments, p. 174.

of different sects, than a question of religion affecting the consciences of the parents. We need hardly say how exactly all this is opposite to the position of Catholics. First (with the exception of a handful of Ritualists too few and insignificant to be regarded in the settlement of a great national question), all the Protestant sects are agreed among themselves, not only that everything really necessary is taught by what they delight to call "our common Protestantism," but also that "Popery" is a "soul-destroying heresy," "Antichrist," &c. &c. Common sense decides that men with whom these are first principles can undertake the education of Catholic children only with the purpose, conscious or unconscious, of drawing them away from the faith of their parents. If, with their prejudices, they really were indifferent on this subject, theirs would indeed be a refinement of uncharitableness. It is certain therefore that Protestant teachers, unless they are wholly indifferent to religion, will, directly or indirectly, use the influence which all teachers worth anything acquire, and ought to acquire, for the purpose of undermining the religion of their Catholic pupils. To say that, however deep may be their own religious convictions, a sense of honour and duty will make them carefully abstain from influencing their pupils, is not only unreasonable in itself, but is contradicted by experience. No man will pretend that the ordinary teachers and managers of schools throughout England will all of them be more high-minded, more honourable, and more scrupulously just, than the late Protestant Archbishop Whately. Now he, as we reminded the readers of our last number, held for years a most prominent place in the administration of the Irish educational system, the fundamental principle of which, solemnly laid down and accepted by himself and all its managers, was that it was to be wholly free from all suspicion of proselytism. Never while he lived did he venture to disown that principle. Yet he stated, in private, to his friend Mr. Senior, "The education supplied by the National Board is *gradually undermining* the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church"; and adds, "To give up this system would be to give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from Popery." Why he never publicly avowed this object he also explained: "I cannot venture," he said, "openly to profess this opinion. I cannot support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion. I have to fight its battle with one hand, and that my best, tied behind me." Remembering this, what security can we possibly feel that the managers and teachers of the schools proposed to be set up in England, whether they profess to give merely secular education or to teach the principles of some Protestant sect, from which teaching our children are to be secured

by a conscience-clause, will not intentionally and deliberately do their best to "undermine" their faith; although, like Archbishop Whately, they "dare not openly profess" to do so? Why should we suppose that they will have a sense of honour more delicate than his? or that they will feel to be dishonourable a course of conduct, which he was not ashamed to avow as having been his own deliberate practice during thirty years?

Moreover, if we could be sure that the teachers in these Protestant schools, reversing Archbishop Whately's system, would honestly do their utmost to prevent any injury to the religion of their Catholic pupils, it is certain that the attempt would be beyond their power. To the members of Protestant sects, as we have already said, a conscience-clause may be an effectual though hardly a necessary security; but this is because the difference between the religious teaching of one and the other is, at the utmost, nothing more than a few positive statements which one sect makes and another denies. Many Dissenters, for instance, object that their children should learn what the Catechism of the Establishment teaches as to the effects of Baptism. Such positive teaching a conscience-clause may prevent easily enough, and in the general tone and atmosphere of the schools there is no real difference. But what Catholic parents dislike in a Protestant school, is not any positive teaching; it is that every such school is thoroughly penetrated by an atmosphere which they feel to be both irreligious and immoral. And even if this were not the case, there would still be a total absence of that tone and character, without which children cannot be trained in Catholic habits of thought, word, and action. It would be a great mistake to suppose that the effect of this deficiency is merely negative. As long as we live, but most especially in the pliant season of youth the spring-time of life, all of us, whether we know it or not, are day by day ripening and maturing, for good or for evil. Suppose, therefore, that a Protestant teacher should sincerely endeavour not to influence his Catholic pupils, their characters must still be inevitably influenced many times every day, both by him and by their fellow-pupils.

To Catholics these considerations are so axiomatic, that we should apologize for enlarging on them, if it were not that to Protestants,—even the most liberal and fair-minded—they are utterly unknown. If the present Bill were practically to result in the attendance of Catholic children at Protestant schools (however defended by conscience-clauses), it would inflict a very serious injury; and if it issued in their compulsory attendance at them, it would be a real and most mischievous persecution. Though by no means without anxiety, we think that

this will not be its effect. There is much in the argument that where school boards are established, the expense they will incur by subsidizing the existing schools will be much less than if they should found new ones. Then the general feeling of the nation is strongly against secular schools, and in favour of denominational education. We suspect that it will be found in practice that each of the leading sects will be almost as anxious to have its own children taught in its own schools as we ourselves can be. No doubt the religious teaching given to a labourer's child, between five and twelve years, will be much the same, whether the school he attends is called Dissenting or Episcopal. But although the teaching is substantially the same, it is not given by the same people. This is what really makes all the difference. Youth is the season when associations are fixed on our minds. A child accustomed to see his school daily visited by the rector and his daughters, and to look forward to the gala day when he goes with his school-fellows to feast and play in the parsonage grounds, takes naturally to the Establishment, unless any special inducement draws him in another direction. The associations formed in the dissenting school tend by the same process towards the meeting. This we believe is so much felt, that any sensible clergyman will do all he can to have the poor children of his parish taught in his own rather than in the meeting school. The influences thus brought to bear on behalf of the denominational system can hardly fail to be strong, in a country where the traditional and conservative feeling is as powerful as it is among us. And by this Bill, if the denominational system is continued for Anglicans, it will be impossible to debar Catholics from its benefits.

We take for granted, what we believe, that the Government really wishes to maintain the denominational system, and only to allow educational boards to introduce secular schools where such is the decided wish of a particular place. Assuming this, there is one amendment that can hardly be refused. It should be added to clause 85, which allows the Educational Department to refuse a share in the Parliamentary grant to schools which it decides to be unnecessary; that a new school shall not be accounted unnecessary merely because there are in the district schools sufficient to receive all the children, if there are a fair number of families without any school of their own denomination. This may be required in justice by other denominations. It is certain to be needed by Catholics. It is to be remembered that for many years after Government grants were made towards building schools in connection with all Protestant sects, the schools of the Catholic Church were exceptionally excluded

from them. It was not until 1847 that the Minutes of Council extended the benefits of the Parliamentary grant to Catholic schools. If therefore the present Bill should in practice deprive denominational schools hereafter to be established in districts where the school boards are brought into operation, of aid from the Parliamentary grant, nothing could be less equal than its operation upon Catholics, and upon those who have received aid from Parliamentary grants many years before it was extended to them. That in this we are asking nothing unreasonable appears by the practice of the country in which state education has been carried farthest. In Prussia it is a fixed principle that although a district is already sufficiently supplied with secular schools, yet either Catholics or Protestants receive every encouragement to establish one for their own children. They are not only entitled to the most liberal aid from the national revenue, but are exempted from the payment of the education rate, on the ground of having their own schools to support. It is evident that if the denominational schools are to have equal chance with others, this cannot be refused to Catholics in England.

Another point in which Catholic schools ought in justice to be put on the same footing as those opened by the school boards, is in having a title to aid, beyond that allowed by the ordinary regulations of the Educational Department, in districts exceptionally poor. The Catholics form, in many districts, the whole of the poorest population; it is therefore but common justice that they should have the same claim to exceptional grants which is given in exceptional cases to schools opened by the boards, by sect. 84 of the Bill.

It is, of course, impossible that Catholics can expect equal justice from the school boards after the experience we have already had of the gross injustice habitually practised by London vestries and the visiting magistrates of gaols. There can be no reason to suppose that the school boards will be animated by a better spirit. It is much to be wished that some great change could be made as to their appointment. But we hardly see that Catholics would be likely to meet with justice from the mass of local boards, by whomsoever they might be elected. The provision that if aid is given from the rates to any of the existing schools, it must be given on equal terms to all, is no doubt exceedingly important. Nothing in the Act pleases us better than the provisions which give large powers to the central Educational Department. From that alone we are convinced that Catholics can expect equal justice. We would wish, therefore, that the right of appeal to the central authority

in all cases of grievance, of whatever kind, should be most explicitly preserved on terms much stronger and less equivocal than those actually used in the Bill.

We have noted down one or two other minor amendments which seem to us necessary in order to secure the principle of the Bill,* namely that the denominational system is still to be encouraged, unless where it is found insufficient. But we pass on to a point which seems to us more important than all others—that now is the time when it has practically to be settled whether or not the poor Catholic children among us are to receive a Catholic education. It is indeed most important that a longer time should be allowed in the clause which permits the school boards to come into operation in any district, unless sufficient schools are provided within a year after they have been declared to be wanting. We trust that every possible exertion will be made to get this time extended to another year at least. Nor do we see with what show of justice this can be refused to Catholics, especially considering the immense masses of the poorer class for whom we have to supply education. But it would not be safe to calculate on the success of these exertions; and if the Bill should pass in its present form, it will hardly be two years before the new system will be in active operation. Everything will depend upon its finding the Catholic population already provided with schools sufficient to receive their children, and coming up to the standard of teaching required by the Committee of Council as a condition of annual grants, supplied with Catholic schools. For our own part, we expect that in most districts in which a school-rate is levied, it will be chiefly spent in assisting existing schools. Wherever that is the case, Catholic schools, if already existing and reaching the standard of secular teaching required by the Educational Department, will have a right to their full share. It is not too much to expect that in many cases this, together with the annual aid from the Government grants, and the payments made by the children, will nearly, if not wholly, meet the

* It would be well, for instance, that it should be stated explicitly that the "conscience-clause" is not to be interpreted as preventing the use of any "observance" which may be desired by the managers of the school, but only as allowing children, at the desire of their parents, to withdraw from it. We think also that if the same inspectors are to visit all schools (a change in itself not unreasonable), something should be done to compensate for the important advantage which the Anglican body will derive from the fact that the great mass of the present inspectors are Anglican clergymen, while there is no Catholic priest, and no minister of any other Protestant denomination on the list.

We also think additional securities should be provided for the local publication of bye-laws adopted by the school boards.

future annual expenses of the school. But the new system must find our schools already in possession. No one can say how much will depend on that. It is quite possible that if the present opportunity is allowed to go by, we may find it exceedingly difficult to get the schools we may hereafter provide admitted to a fair share in the educational funds, whether national or local. The present is clearly the critical time. Never, probably, has there been any at which half so much has been at stake. Catholics, as such, have in their religious orders and their general organization, facilities for keeping up first-class schools, which no other religious body can rival. We heartily hope that no Catholic Church in England, which has any poor population (and which is without it?), may be without a school receiving aid from the Parliamentary grant before Christmas, 1871. Upon this, to speak the truth, all depends. If it is obtained, the future prospects of Catholic education will be most promising; for we believe that, to say the least, a very large proportion of them will at once receive assistance from the proposed rate. If not, the very best we can have to hope is, that we may perhaps hereafter gain, by a long and difficult struggle, the advantages which at this crisis are offering themselves to our acceptance. The importance, therefore, of the present crisis it is quite impossible to exaggerate. There are numerous missions in which the schools, owing to the difficulty of obtaining local subscriptions, or because they have not been provided with certificated teachers, have hitherto got on as well as they could without a share in the Parliamentary grant. In most cases the managers have looked forward to this as a thing to be some day or other attained. It will be well that the Catholics in every such district should make up their minds, that the present Bill practically limits that "some time or other" to the next two years. It may, perhaps, not be impossible that even if the present opportunity is allowed to slip away unimproved, we may be able at some future time to repair the omission; but whether it will be so found or not is more than any one can yet tell. What may be done now is, humanly speaking, certain. If Catholics throughout England really exert themselves to the utmost, there is no reason why the new system, when it comes into operation, may not find a Catholic school already in possession wherever there is a Catholic population, and still less reason why the Catholic schools should not be the most efficient in connection with the Committee of Council. Should that be the case, our own impression is, that we have everything to hope and little to fear from the new Government measure. If not, it is understating the matter to say, that it may require years of strenuous exertion to place us

in a position with regard to Catholic education, as favourable as that which we occupied when it was brought forward. What we have now to do is to be up and doing without the loss of an hour.*

Since this article was in type the second reading of the Government Bill has been passed without a division—of itself, we imagine, a fact quite without precedent in the case of any measure so vast and momentous. Mr. Gladstone, in the conciliatory speech in which he summed up the debate, while pledging himself to retain its principles, promised to give the fullest consideration to all the objections which had been urged against the details. He held out expectations that changes would be introduced in Committee: first, in the mode of electing the school-boards, “in order to give due scope to the action of popular—which, in this case, would, for the most part, be parental—feeling.” Coupling this with what he added, that in such a case “property should not too much dominate over the principle of personal representation,” we suppose it to mean that all rate-payers are to have equal votes, whereas, in ordinary cases, those most highly rated have two votes or more, but the small rate-payers only one. We do not see clearly how this would work; but of one thing we are quite sure: if the measure is to work fairly, it should be declared in the Act that the religious character of the new schools (where such are founded) shall, *as far as possible*, be the same as that of the parents for whose

* Since this was written Mr. Winterbotham has explained in Parliament why the Dissenters do not feel that it is safe to let their children attend church-schools, although defended with the proposed “conscience clause.” He quoted the words of the Bishop of Winchester’s charge at Oxford, that “the three great obstacles to religious and moral progress of the people are beer-shops, dissent, and over-crowded cottages.” He added that “if all the bishops of the Church of England were Thirlwalls or Temples the House would hear no more of these objections or misgivings, for the Dissenters could trust such men,” and that the Bishop of Winchester is “a very fair type of the attitude of the Church towards dissent throughout the country.” Certainly those who speak thus ought to support the demand that schools taught by Catholics should be provided for Catholic children; for beyond a doubt, the fanatic hatred of our religion is far more rampant among the class from which schoolmasters, town-councillors, and vestrymen are taken, than even among the most violent of the clergy. No man certainly would for a moment think of comparing the zeal of the Anglican clergy against dissent with that which prevails among those classes against “Popery.” Mr. Winterbotham’s statement therefore is a distinct admission that no “conscience clause,” however devised, will be the least protection to Catholic children against intentional and deliberate attempts to undermine their religion, on the part both of the teachers and managers and of the pupils, in the schools which are to be provided by the school-boards.

children they are provided ; and full power to enforce this provision should be given, not to the local school-boards, but to the Government Educational Department. We do not however at all see why the system urged by the "Tablet," which is reported as working well by Mr. Fraser in Canada, and which is also practically in force in Prussia, should not be introduced into this Bill. That principle is very simple, and goes as near as possible to securing the parental and religious rights of minorities. Mr. Fraser, in his Report on the Common School System, after saying that all denominations and coloured people enjoy the same rights, writes thus (p. 254) :—

A Roman Catholic separate school may be established whenever any number of persons, not less than five, being heads of families and freeholders or householders, resident within a day-school section, incorporated village or town, or within any ward of any city or town, and being Roman Catholics, choose to convene a public meeting of persons desiring to establish a separate school for Roman Catholics in such section or ward, for the election of trustees for the management of the same.

The trustees of the separate school have the same duties and responsibilities as the trustees of a common school. They can impose, levy, and collect school rates or subscriptions upon and from persons sending children to, or subscribing towards, the support of such separate school.

Every person who gives notice in writing to the clerk of the municipality that he is a Roman Catholic, and a supporter of a Catholic school, is exempted from the common school rates.

The separate school is entitled to a share in all grants for education, except that accruing from the local assessment for common school purposes.

By this means the Catholic trustees rate their fellow-Catholics in the district, who thereby become exempted from the common school rate, and are supporters of their own school. After sixteen years of legislation in Canada upon the subject of local rates and the "religious difficulty," this is the law which was finally enacted in 1863, and has been satisfactorily in force ever since. This system might be attended with some slight difficulty in villages where the numbers of the different denominations are small; and it would be reasonable that Government should fix a minimum number of scholars, as it does at present, below which no local or Government aid should be received. But even such a difficulty as this would have no existence whatever in a large town like Liverpool, where the proportions in which the hitherto uneducated children, divided between Anglicans, Catholics, Wesleyans, &c., are large and most easily ascertained. The children are crowded into a space so small that there will be no real difficulty in providing separate schools for each. And there can be no reason beyond that which may be

furnished by religious bigotry why the management of such separate denominational schools should not be given to the respective denominations, the Board retaining a certain right to see that the rates, &c., are properly employed. If this is not done, where it can be done without needless cost or inconvenience, it will show that the real object of those who work the measure, is not merely to provide education for children who would otherwise have none, but, even more, to draw them away from the religion of their parents. Our experience of vestries and the like compel us to believe that, if they can, the proposed school-board will, most probably, work the Act for this last purpose. That a Government Department will do so we do not believe. It is therefore essential, however the boards are appointed, that the Act should distinctly require that the religion to be taught in every school provided by them shall be that of the parents of the children for whom the school is provided, as far as is possible under the circumstances; and that in case of their violating or evading this rule, it shall be incumbent on the Government Department, on appeal, to compel them to observe it.

We think it far more important to secure the religious rights of parents by the express words of the Act, and to give full powers to the Government Department to enforce it, than to make any conceivable regulations about the election of the school-boards. At the same time, it seems clear that great care should be taken to secure the representation of minorities on the boards. We incline to think that, if the boards are to be chosen by the ratepayers at large, each voter ought to have only one vote where the number to be elected is three, and two votes where six are to be elected. Whatever objection may be felt to the representation of minorities in Parliamentary elections, nothing of the sort can apply here; for, however inherent may be the right of the majority to make laws for the nation, the minority have a right still more incontestable to have their children educated as they, and not as the majority, think best.

Another concession indicated by Mr. Gladstone was, that in public schools in which the religious instruction preferred by the majority is given by the master, "it shall be made compulsory upon the local authorities to grant the use of the school-room to the representatives of other opinions, so that they may not be without the means of securing that instruction which the majority receives." There may, perhaps, be cases in which the benefit of this clause may be claimed by Catholics. But we think it will be of little value. Our opinion, that no such arrangement can make it safe or tolerable that Catholic children should attend Protestant schools, is as strong as ever. Be the pre-

cautions and securities what they may, we shall feel that the Bill is most mischievous and unfair if it leads to the education of our Catholic children in Protestant schools.

But Mr. Gladstone's chief concession is with regard to the "Conscience Clause." As originally proposed, the Bill, as we have seen, provided that no child should be required to be present at any instruction or observance to which its parents have objected in writing on religious grounds. This left it free to the managers of the school to mix religion to any degree they might think desirable with the secular teaching. Prayers might be said, as in Catholic schools they commonly are, at the striking of the clock, although any child would be at liberty to withdraw if its parents so desired. Instead of this, Mr. Gladstone proposes to concede (what had been strongly urged by the League party) that "there should be a complete separation in time between the religious and what is called the secular instruction." This, if it means anything at all, must mean that during the hours in each day devoted to secular instruction, nothing is to be said or done which has any religious bearing. We can hardly express our sense of the evil this will necessarily cause. To say nothing of Catholic schools, Dr. Temple, the new Bishop of Exeter, whom no man ever suspects of any want of liberality, and who was for years connected with the training school at Kneller Hall, in advocating this very Bill a few days ago, pointed out at length the immense importance of the religious character of the master, and his conviction that that religious character would suffer if he were confined to secular teaching. He said :

I believe it makes an almost incalculable difference to children whether the atmosphere they breathe in the school is that which surrounds a religious man. Without a man saying anything directly about religion, if he makes it felt that he is really a worshipper of God, a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, I am quite sure he makes a real impression on the children. I say this, without any reference to the difference between churchmen and dissenters, because I think that in this matter, if secular schools were to be established, Nonconformists would lose quite as much as churchmen would lose. I think they too would find that the schools, not having a really religious tone, would be by no means such as to make a good preparation for a religious education to be given by the minister afterwards.

We repeat here what Dr. Temple says. If this marked separation is made between religious and secular instruction, we are certain that the religious character of the school will suffer to a degree which Protestants themselves will feel.

That Catholic schools will lose very much more is certain. In fact, a school in which all reference to religion is prohibited during the greater part of the day, may be a school

taught by a Catholic, but can hardly be a Catholic school. The answer to this will of course be, that such is the system in the Irish National schools, which Protestants never fail to tell us have succeeded. In theory, such is the case. In practice, it is well-known that the Irish schools are, almost without exception, either Protestant or Catholic, and that their mixed character is wholly theoretical. So far as it has been real the influence of the schools has been anti-religious. It is a mockery to tell us that the Irish system may safely be imitated in England, after Dr. Whately's opinion has been published, that the mixed schools are "gradually undermining the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church";—that "if we give up mixed education we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from Popery"; and especially that what he most feared was, lest the Government grant should be extended to schools which came up to the required standard of secular teaching, leaving the managers to give what religious instruction they pleased. Such schools he declared would be "so many Maynooths." (Life, vol. ii. p. 246.) This proves that he did not mean (as the "Times" laboured to explain away his words) that, believing Protestantism to be true, he believed that education in itself would be favourable to it. On the contrary, he saw clearly that the highest education would only strengthen the Catholic Church, if it were religious education, and given by Catholics, and that it was by mixed education alone that he could "undermine" the religion of the people. To imitate therefore this system in England, would be to imitate what was expressly defended by its ablest advocate as tending to undermine the religion of Catholics; and what he admitted could not really be defended on any other ground; for, he added, that not being able to defend mixed schools "as an instrument of conversion," he had to "fight their battle with one hand, and that his best, tied behind him."

ART. VIII.—IS IRELAND IRRECONCILABLE?

A Correct Report of the Speech of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, on proposing the Irish Land Bill, February 15, 1870. London : John Murray.

Irish Land Bill. Second Reading. Speech of the Right Hon. Chichester Fortescue, M.P. London : Robert John Bush.

THE state of Ireland throughout the autumn and winter which have passed may be likened to a day, such as often comes on its western coast, when the one season is passing into the other, and all the elements seem to be mingled in the weather. Overhead masses of cloud, gaunt and vast, career across a sky, at one moment muffled in gloomy vapour fringed with fire, at another so blue, so lofty, and so clear, that the pale light of the moon and the strong ray of the Northern Star aid in its atmosphere the labouring flame which strives almost in vain to assert the realm of day. He who hears the ocean break, when in those days the indefatigable sou'-wester hurls wave after wave against the mountain scarp of the coast of Clare, will not find much of melancholy in the music with which the Atlantic first hails the shores of Ireland—but a sound like the cheering of many men in the stress of some great labour, with now and then an undertone of joyous melody, felt as it were through the sphere, when a tall billow, which has made its boisterous way from Labrador, sinks to sudden rest on velvet sand under the echoing dome of some stalactite-encrusted cave. But when the tide falls at the same hour that the sun is setting in this climacteric of the year, then the cloud-compelling wind pauses for a while, and the peace which falls upon land and sea is, in the variety of its beauty, the depth of its serenity, and the extent of its horizon, peculiar to the place and of its genius. The broad golden track that marks the line of the sunset on the waters, visibly connects earth and sky. Nowhere does the sun sink in such an aureole of light and such a canopy of colour, with such a glow of longing ardour, and such a lingering pomp of promise. Nowhere in our latitudes are clouds to be seen of such strange shapes and such vivid colours—violet, vermillion and purple, and crimson and azure and orange, and the white of the dove's down, and the tender green of young leaves. Weary ocean makes a truce with land, and seems to have changed its hue for that of the invincible verdure, which gleams through every

fissure of the scarred rocks and mantles the stalwart battlements of the bay. Already the dawning moonlight falls softly on the venerable cone of that Round Tower on Scattery's holy isle, where Christ was worshipped first in the far west; and bleaches the sails of the Boston-bound emigrant-ship rushing swiftly over the bar on the flood of the Shannon.

He who passed through Ireland, and especially through the north of Ireland last midsummer, when Parliament was despatching through its last processes the work of severing the connection between the Protestant Church and the State, would, if he had truly tried to sound the *état des esprits*, to ascertain the genuine state of mind of the people—if he had spoken with them as man to man in their cabins, or at their rugged work in the fields they love so well, or at their chapel doors after the Sunday's mass,—he would have found there for a brief space a peace that passed common understanding. All that is generous, pious, and noble in the Irish heart was profoundly affected by what had come to pass so strangely and so suddenly. It moved the nation through the piety of its nature and with a touch of awe. For it was unlike all such concessions as the Irish had previously obtained from the Imperial authority in this respect, that it had not come to them through the hard patience of hope deferred, and the noisy exertations of political agitation, but, as it were, through the Providence of God acting on the justice of man. There was no great tribune of their own,—no Grattan, Plunket, O'Connell,—to whom the glory could be assigned. In the grand debates which they had read during the year which followed the introduction of Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions, they had felt not without pain that there was no orator among the Irish members like the great leaders of old; no speaker who could be named on the same level with the Englishmen who bore the brunt of that great argument, with Gladstone, and Bright, and Lowe. But, above all, they clearly recognized the indomitable will and the splendid energy of Mr. Gladstone's genius. They knew less of him, perhaps, in some senses, than of any English statesman of anything like the same eminence who has held power since the Union. But they knew that when Mr. Dillwyn first, after a lapse of many years, effectually brought the question of the Irish Church before Parliament in 1865, Mr. Gladstone had made a speech for which he had to sacrifice the great honour of representing Oxford University. Again his words, spoken though they were when he was moving the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in 1866, that Ireland, in all that concerned its special interests, should be governed "according to the views

of the majority of the people of that country," sank deep into their memory. Then came on Mr. Maguire's decisive motion in 1868, the great speech, whose pith is all in one sentence, a sentence whose happy and magnificent daring is, we believe, unparalleled in the annals of Parliament—"That Church, as a State Church, must cease to exist." And now, at the period of which we write, within one single year, that word had become deed, and the work which O'Connell had been obliged to compromise when he had all Ireland at his back, had found the man who was capable of bringing England and Scotland to his side, to complete it. With the great gratitude which the people felt then, no ignoble feeling mingled. Any one who sounded their mind would have found that, bewildered as they were at the secret swiftness with which victory had deserted the flag of their oppressors, yet their speech and bearing well became a Christian and a gentle people. The Irish Catholic did not stoop to insult the Irish Protestant in that hour, to him, of keen disappointment, and a humiliation that seemed almost to attain his blood. For a few days there was a great fear of wide-spread disturbances in Ulster; and if they had gained any head, the result would have been, throughout three or four counties, a sort of civil war on a small scale. The Ulster Catholics would have defended themselves like brave men had there been occasion; but, like good men, when they saw their enemies, who were withal their neighbours, humbled, they were silent. Throughout the province, while the Bill was passing through its last stages in the House of Lords, fife and drum, speech and song, the flag on the church-spire, and the tar-barrel on the hill-top, told from Derry walls to the slopes of Mourne the joy of the Orangemen because one Dutch general with an army, in which there was a regiment of Ulster Protestants, had won a victory over the Irish Catholics at the Boyne, and another Dutch general with an army, in which there were no Irish Protestants at all, had won such another victory at Aughrim. But in a few days there was a great cry in all the lodges that the cause was lost, and lost by an Ulster Protestant; that Lord Cairns had "sold the pass"; and an hour of no ignoble triumph came home to the heart of the Ulster Catholic—of triumph then and there; not the vain memory of an incident of distant and irrelevant history, but a great present, visible, and tangible act of State, annulling for ever three centuries of policy; a great act of public penance and reparation on the part of Parliament; an utter levelling of the grand monument of Protestant ascendancy by the hands of the power that had raised it. It was as much of a miracle as ever occurs in human politics, and the

people to whom it was vouchsafed seemed to think so, and received it with a pious magnanimity beautiful to witness. Every Irish Catholic felt the air of his native land freer; but he also felt a sort of reverent pity for his neighbour, stunned at first by the fact that he was really in a sense excommunicated from that Constitution which had become almost as much a part of his religion as his Bible; and accordingly, even where faction had been most fierce, there were no insulting celebrations, nor was the humbled pride of the Protestant hurt by bell, or bonfire, or ballad. There have been a great many clouds in the western sky since that bright hour, but who may despair of a people whose first impulses at such a moment were so noble!

There have, indeed, been many changes in the mood of the Irish nation since those brief days, during which their ancient Saints seemed to soften the air of the land again; and when one tries to sound what is in the mind of the same people now, one is tempted to think of the strange saying of Frederick Schlegel, that, after all, "History is an incessant struggle of nations and individuals against invisible powers." How account for the turmoil, the confusion, the rapid explosions of actual crime; the endemic criminality that has suddenly run like a belt across the middle of the island from Meath to Mayo, connecting the county of the richest graziers and the county of the poorest cottiers in the country in one bond of vagabond violence; the preposterous turbulence of public declamation—grown men of grave character, of public experience, of reverend station,—at a time when Cabinet Councils were sitting week after week wholly occupied with the preparation of a Land Law, better than the Irish members had ever ventured to ask from Parliament, foaming as if Strafford's head were plotting in the Castle or Cromwell's cannon thundering at the walls; uttering words of wild wrath, railing, imprecating, denouncing, as if "the study of revenge, immortal hate," were the sole lesson fit for such a time and such a people. And at the end, where do we stand? With Mr. Gladstone proposing a law to Parliament touching the liberty of the subject in Ireland, such as Mr. Pitt could not have carried with Mr. Fox sitting before him, such as Louis Napoleon would have shrunk from decreeing in Paris the day after the *coup d'état*, such as the Irish Parliament would perhaps have hesitated to pass even when Hoche's squadron was in Bantry Bay, and which now, nevertheless, hardly a dozen Irish members seriously affect to oppose, formally dividing like fuglemen of imaginary forces—not moved by any such very solemn indignation as might be expected in the premisses, but rather evidently (with some

two or three exceptions) thinking it just as well that their country should submit quietly to the strait-waistcoat.

Much allowance should nevertheless be made for the habit of language of the Irish people. While the Englishman, without the least degree of conscious insincerity, but rather perhaps fancying that he is most sincere when he is carefully chary of words, tends to say rather less than he means, the Irishman spontaneously tends to say more. The Irish peasant still thinks in Irish, even though he speaks in English—thinks in an antique oriental dialect of vivid tropes and purple words, warmed and softened by his fervid Catholicism, while he is expected to express himself in the accurate and complex, but recent language of the least imaginative and sympathetic, if the most truthful and tough-willed, of races. Moreover, the political vocabulary of the country received all its form and colouring in an atmosphere of circumambient oppression, oppression of poverty, of conscience, of the negation of civil rights, and dereliction of social status, of a dominant Church, a dominant caste, and a dominant race. It is not quite easy to change the habit of the mind and the tongue formed for generations, and which corresponded truly enough with the conditions of the country for so many ages, in the course of twelve months. It is still some rude version of the rhetoric of O'Connell, flavoured with Moore's melodies, as his usually was, that we commonly hear on our Irish platforms—menace and flattery oddly intermingled, much of true pathos, much of broad humour, an occasional point of keen and striking sense, an ugly flash of truculence, or a foul touch of personality now and then—and, latterly, which is indeed lamentable, a strong flavour of the new flamboyant American figure of Buncombe, which has unhappily forced its way, extruding in some degree the more racy and subtle pleonasm of Blarney. Providence could hardly assign to the Irish people in their civil order at this moment a greater gift than a political leader, who, with Daniel O'Connell's wide intelligence of the conditions of their lot, and magnetic susceptibility to the whole range of their emotions, could unite John Bright's power of clear, candid, and exact speech.

Much allowance should also be made for the traditions of Irish agitation. What were they? That England never yet was known to yield anything to Ireland except from a sense of panic or shame; and that as England, whenever she did yield, yielded with an ill grace, and always reserved a little of what was justly demanded from her, in order to save her pride, it was the best possible policy to ask for the utmost that one could conceivably claim. O'Connell, presenting the Bill of

Rights of the Irish people to Parliament, being always and in all things a lawyer, in his own mind perhaps rather regarded it as a bill of costs, which should be drawn so as to include the taxing master's selva. He remembered and he taught his people that Catholics were first enabled to become educated and to hold landed property when the capitulation of Cornwallis at Yorktown made it plain that America had established her revolt; first enabled to vote, hold commissions, and practise liberal professions, when the defeat of the Duke of Brunswick at Valmy revealed the portentous military force of the French Revolution; first permitted to sit in Parliament because, brought face to face with the fact of the Clare election, the Duke of Wellington preferred, on the whole, to take the risk of spoiling the balance of the British Constitution to the risk of civil war. And at periods such as these it has so happened that the political patrons of the Irish always said to them:—"Now is your time. Make yourselves troublesome. Be turbulent. Agitate! agitate!"—all which considerations O'Connell reduced to the handy maxim, "England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity." What has this simple people learned since to void the teaching of that immoral moral?

The conduct of the Liberal party towards the Irish people for the last twenty-five years must also be considered. Nothing has transpired concerning the case of the Established Church that was not known when the Appropriation Clause was debated—nothing regarding the condition of the Irish tenant that was not known when the Devon Commission reported. But that great party, which had received the unbroken support of the Irish Catholics at every general election since their emancipation, was gradually passing, so lately as five years ago, from a state of ignoble apathy to a state of pronounced hostility to their claims. During the great agitation they had said to Ireland,—“Repeal the Union! Restore the Heptarchy! It is impossible. But abandon the demand for a separate legislature, and we will gladly redress your grievous wrongs.” To the agitation succeeded the attempt at insurrection in 1848. Then it was said,—“Treat with rebels! Never. But when law and order are restored, then you shall see what our statesmen can do.” Law and order were restored. The Repeal Association, the Young Ireland party, had ceased to exist. The best men of both sections united in the support of a parliamentary policy, proposing substantially, indeed almost precisely, the same solutions of the Church and the Land questions which are now being carried. It was then said,—“The Famine is settling the Land question. Your people are going

—going with a vengeance. Besides, your religion debases the intellect and enslaves the soul; and the Pope has made an aggression on the prerogatives of the Queen. Moreover, your Parliamentary policy is only Toryism in disguise. Have as many Catholic judges as you please, but for the rest, go to." Then was dug the grave of the Independent Opposition, which soon served for the foundations of Fenianism; and thence the country became undermined with conspiracy, and a dull and gloomy calm followed, in which the oracles said,—“The Irish are going still. Let them go. It is the duty of every Irishman to go to America in order to make room for a bullock. Ireland is prosperous. Ireland is peaceful. Ireland is becoming the mother of lowing herds and bleating sheep. Let us bray.” But then came, as it were, an earthquake through the body politic; and we have all heard not long ago in Parliament of pills that are good for the earthquake. One Viceroy was made an earl, and another a duke—one Chief-Secretary was made a Grand Cross of the Bath, and another a Governor-General of India for having cured the earthquake with pills. But it is not so easy to cure earthquakes.

It is indeed almost impossible to realize now the depth of imbecility and insolence which characterized the language of the Liberal statesmen of this period whenever they spoke of the affairs of Ireland. Lord Palmerston reigned and governed. He said of the Ulster tenant-right:—“Tenant-right is landlord wrong.” He said of the principle of retrospective compensation:—“A retrospective enactment, which transfers from the landlord to the tenant that which by law has hitherto been the property of the former, which both parties know and have always known to be his property, an Act which does this is, I conceive, most unjust, and ought not to be allowed.” When a much more moderate Bill than the Bill of the present Government was introduced in 1858, he said:—“The main and fundamental principle of this Bill appears to me to be at variance with justice. . . . It would be trifling with the House, and an abuse of its forms, to read it a second time.” The Irish Secretaries of this period were Mr. Horsman, Mr. Cardwell, and Sir Robert Peel. Mr. Horsman has lately somewhat patronizingly censured his party for not having made enough hitherto of Irish questions. When he was at the Castle, a *mot* was made by, or more probably invented for him, to express his sense of his duties:—“Carlisle does the State. Larcom does the work. I hunt.” His first parliamentary appearance in the capacity of Irish Secretary was when he divided the House of Commons successfully against Serjeant

Shee on the question of Retrospective Compensation.* The only other sign of public vigour that he exhibited while he was in Ireland was a rather scurrilous attack upon the Council of the Tenant League. Not without regret we cite Mr. Cardwell in the same category. He is supposed to be a statesman. He has sat in cabinets for ten years. Let us hope that in other departments he does not leave the same *damnosa hæreditas* as he left at the Castle. On the question of the Protestant Establishment, in reply to Mr. Bernal Osborne, Mr. Cardwell said so lately as 1863: "What the honourable gentleman really means is an abstract resolution of this House condemning the Irish Church. . . . I believe this House will not surrender the principle of an Established Church. I believe it will not alienate the property of the Church from the ecclesiastical uses to which it has been devoted." But, on the Land Question, Mr. Cardwell legislated with an ostentatious profession that he was finally closing the subject, so far as law could close anything. His Landlord and Tenant Act was the only measure regarding the social condition of the Irish people, as the Ecclesiastical Titles Act was the only one regarding their religious liberties, that had been passed through Parliament by Liberal Governments since the death of O'Connell; and the two Acts, however different in their intent, were alike in this, that each was a dead letter from the moment it received the Queen's signature. Parliamentary returns, moved for session after session, showed that in no single instance had the provisions of the Cardwell Act been availed of—and this really means (because even Irishmen do not habitually and universally neglect their obvious interest) that its provisions had not been found practically available by the agricultural tenantry of Ireland.

Mr. Maguire, whose persevering and energetic zeal throughout this dreary period deserves most honourable record, in 1865 obtained a Select Committee to inquire into the operation of the Cardwell Act. Touching its nomination, there was a scene in Parliament which no Irishman who witnessed it will easily forget. Mr. Roebuck, evidently speaking the sense of both sides of the House, for he was cheered all round, especially when he used the word "eviscerating"—appealed to Lord Palmerston in these terms:—

* Lord Palmerston, having (4th May, 1855) agreed to the retrospective clause, No. 14 in Serjeant Shee's Bill, Mr. Horsman, in Committee (5th July) proposed to limit compensation to twenty years (ayes, 141; noes, 37); and to the amount of four years' rent (ayes, 180; noes, 54). The amended clause was then rejected in another division, and the Bill withdrawn.

I would ask the noble lord, if he should consent to any Committee on this subject, to appoint a Committee composed of men of cross-examining powers, or, as I once heard a learned friend of mine call it, eviscerating powers, because, with such a Committee, a man with notions about tenant-right, and belief that he possesses some talismanic means of settling all these questions, no sooner appears before it than his courage begins to ooze out of him, and you have him not only telling the whole truth, but utterly confounding himself when he is in error.

Lord Palmerston, in his reply, also caught the cheers of both sides of the House by the cheap truism, that he, for his part, could not see "the justice or advantage of giving to one man the right of determining what should be done with another man's property"; and then, nodding to Mr. Roebuck, he said that "if the Committee contained good cross-examiners, so much the better." Any one who may read the evidence of that important Committee, whose proceedings are one of the most curious landmarks in recent Parliamentary history, will discover at least these three things:—First, that if the disgusting epithet employed by Mr. Roebuck, and apparently adopted by the House, can be said to characterize the conduct of any of the members of that Committee, they are Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Lowe, and the Chief Secretary, Sir Robert Peel; secondly, that the Conservative members of the Committee showed much more consideration for the case of the tenantry than did the Liberals, who were identified with the Government; and thirdly, that the Report was in direct contradiction of all the evidence received, the witnesses being, perhaps, the best qualified, in point of authority and experience, that could be found in the country. The Committee very tersely reported that "the principle that compensation should only be secured upon improvements made with the consent of the landlord, should be maintained." And on the 23rd of June, 1865, Mr. Cardwell, in pompous and pitiless words, pronounced this final judgment on the tenant-right cause, to the House of Commons and the Irish people:—

I am exceedingly glad that we are not about to separate under the imputation of having given an uncertain sound upon this subject. Whatever may have been the reasons for this discussion, I think that at any rate we should be open to grave reprehension if we permitted the impression to go forth in Ireland that we are at all uncertain about the rights of property in that country. I wish to express my individual opinion that, by whatever name it may be called, compulsory compensation for improvements effected against the will of the landlord is not a principle which is consistent with the rights of property. . . . I am glad that the Committee has not separated without giving its opinion distinctly on the questions which have been raised,

and I do hope that every effort will be made in all future time, when measures for encouraging the improvement of land in Ireland are brought forward, to give every legitimate facility for such improvements. I wish it may be distinctly understood that only such facilities as are legitimate, and do not interfere with the rights of property, will be sanctioned by Parliament. I am convinced that it is more in accordance with the feeling of a high spirited people that they should be spoken to in plain terms; and I have that opinion of the Irish people that I do not think they would approve an insincere and uncertain course on an important subject like this, or that they would at all thank the Committee for giving an ambiguous opinion upon it.

The language of the Ministers charged with the administration of Ireland at that time, in regard to the grievances which Mr. Gladstone has made Cabinet questions, appeared to be in some degree demented. The transition from the administration of Mr. Cardwell to that of Sir Robert Peel was not inaptly described as the reign of Hugger-Mugger followed by the reign of Harum-Scarum. But the difference was only one of manner, not of method. When Sir Robert Peel was asked by Mr. Maguire early in 1864, whether the Government intended to introduce any measure affecting the relation of landlord and tenant, he replied, in his most supercilious style, that "it was not the intention of Government to introduce any measure *of the nature alluded to.*" Using Lord Palmerston's name in sanction of his statement—and the noble lord never protested,—he had declared a year before that the Government was determined to maintain the Protestant Church Establishment in Ireland at all hazards:—

If, he said, this question is to be agitated again, either in the present session or in the next, it is time for us, no matter on what side we sit, frankly to declare our opinion, and to choose our party for the struggle. I for one unhesitatingly affirm, that if that moment has come, I shall be found—ay, and acting under the advice and guidance of the noble lord at the head of the Government—I shall be found contending on behalf of those principles which for two centuries have ever been—and God grant they may long continue to be—the centre of loyalty to the throne, and the bulwark of civil and religious liberty.

It may be not unfairly said that such an administration as that of Sir Robert Peel was never imposed upon any country by England before, on Bengalees, or Maoris, or Black men, or Red men, or even on Ireland. If Lord Palmerston had designed it, he could not have contrived a counter-irritant more calculated to stimulate to a dangerous heat the stagnant blood of the country. There was not a considerable class of persons in Ireland, from the Catholic bishops to the tenant

farmers, whom the Secretary did not outrage, or at least alienate—the Orangemen of Ulster excepted. The Fenian conspiracy, utterly unobserved by the executive, infiltrated the whole constitution of the country. Who can tell even now how deeply and how widely sympathy with it penetrated this people, who were day after day deliberately and elaborately told by the Ministers of the Crown that they need no longer hope for redress from Parliament? It was at this period that the constabulary became such excellent light infantry that they utterly lost their faculties as a police. The end—and it was the end of much—came like a bolt from the blue. One week Lord Wodehouse congratulated the gentry of Tipperary on the peace which prevailed through their county and throughout the country. The next week Dublin was in a state of siege. For long afterwards Fenianism gave the British statesman, the British sentinel abundant work to do. In the midst of the *mêlée* which he had so considerably helped to bring to a head, Sir Robert Peel retired from office, and received as his reward the same broad riband which is given to the ambassador who concludes an important treaty, or the general who gains a great battle.

But why recapitulate these facts? Why exhume these quotations? Is this a time at which to impeach the past policy of the Liberal party towards Ireland? It is not, indeed; but it is a time at which, if any hope may remain of effecting a good understanding between England and Ireland, it is necessary that the one country should at least hear some explanation of the apparently intractable and unreasonable attitude of the other. Confidence, a plant of slow growth in the bosom of a statesman of seventy, can hardly be expected to ripen like the aloe in that of a nation to which for seven centuries the tradition of oppression, or deception, or neglect has been in turn familiar; and which, not to go very far back, has, for nearly the space of a generation, felt all its best impulses and purposes systematically snubbed by the statesmen of the party in which, with fond credulity, it still persisted in putting its trust.

In a memorable passage of the speech which Mr. Gladstone delivered in introducing the Land Bill, he said:—

Sir, we must not disguise from ourselves that the difficulties of this weighty question have been greatly aggravated by delay. And it can be no wonder, if we reflect on the nature, the constitution, and the duties of the British Parliament, that it should occasionally fall short of the perfect performance of those duties. The operations of the Parliaments elected before the Reform Act of 1832, are in themselves so searching, so comprehensive, and so

beneficial, that I think I shall not be deemed to cast any reflection upon them if I sorrowfully admit that neglect is chargeable upon them in respect to the question of Irish land tenure. . . . I do not now speak of the amount of blame to be divided as between one party and another, or as between one person and another; probably none of us who have sat in Parliament since that epoch are altogether exempt from responsibility.

The neglect so frankly acknowledged here would certainly be sufficiently criminal, on the supposition that Ireland is really regarded as an integral part of the United Kingdom. But in considering the present temper of the Irish people, it is only fair to remember that barely five years ago their claims in regard to land tenure were certainly not, so to speak, neglected by the leaders of the Liberal party; but, on the contrary, carefully and conscientiously examined, "eviscerated," and met with a deliberate and dogmatic denial. What they were told by the ministers charged with their affairs, by Mr. Cardwell and Sir Robert Peel, down to so late a date as mid-summer, 1865, was in effect this,—that the Protestant Establishment was one of the pillars of the empire, and that what they called tenant right was only a flagrant pretext under cover of which they hoped to be enabled to embezzle the property of a deserving class of their fellow-subjects. In whom, then, were the Irish people to have hope? Whence should come the man of men strong enough to roll back by his sheer strength a retrograde policy, and overcome the *vis inertiae* of a bigoted and prejudiced Parliament? Looking beyond the statesmen more particularly charged with the conduct of Irish affairs, and wondering whence were to come the inspiration, the wisdom and the energy adequate to a settlement of Ireland, many thought with hope of the name of Mr. Bright. But if we refer to Mr. Bright's speeches on Irish affairs, we shall find that he was silent during the whole period of twenty years that intervened between the famine and the first Fenian panic. It was generally believed in Ireland that he regarded claims of the character of tenant right as incompatible with the principles of free-trade. Neither he nor Mr. Cobden had ever aided their agitation. Between the temper of Mr. Lowe and the temper of Mr. Roebuck, in considering an Irish grievance, it was supposed there was only a difference of degree, yet Mr. Lowe said, early in 1865,—“Time may have been when Irish subjects were treated with indifference in this House; but to me this is the question of questions for the empire.” Mr. Gladstone, evidently rising steadily to the pinnacle of supreme power, still presented to the mind of the Irish people a figure as inscrutable as the sphinx. They had no

evidence that he had ever concerned himself with them or their affairs. The part he had taken in resisting the Ecclesiastical Titles Act appeared to them, after all, to be that of an Anglican High Churchman rather than that of a Liberal statesman; and they felt that the same order of motives not improbably might lead him to resist the disestablishment of the Protestant Church. All his hours of labour appeared, as yet, to be given to finance, and all his leisure to Homer. Yet there is evidence that already his mind was slowly maturing the outlines of a policy for the government of Ireland. "What we want," he said to an Irish Catholic of great authority, early in 1865, "what we want in Ireland is a policy."* That he had already made up his mind as to what must be done with the Church Establishment was evident soon from his speech on Mr. Dillwyn's motion; and that by that act he had made a great sacrifice to conscience transpired when he shortly afterwards presented himself for re-election to Oxford University. As yet Lord Palmerston lived, as yet the very existence of Fenianism was resolutely discredited by the Irish executive. It is only the truth to say that Mr. Gladstone's course was already taken in advance of the inducements of ambition, before he had to consider the prospect and the responsibilities of supreme power, and before it was necessary to balance the alternatives of subduing or contenting a disaffected population.

Thankful as they were for the fall of the Establishment, the Irish people had long been far more anxious about the Land Question. To the mass of the peasantry, the Church was hardly even a sentimental grievance. A generation had grown to manhood since the last pig had been seized to pay for Protestant worship. The peasant of to-day in so far felt himself a freer man than his father. He had no enmity to the parson, where the parson did not try to pervert his children. What tithe the landlord still paid was, he knew, very skilfully merged in his rent. But how should the question of the rent itself be settled?

Such were the thoughts that lay in the background of the public mind last autumn, when suddenly through the stillness spread such sounds as speak of swiftly rising storm. The people all at once heard themselves called upon to commence a great agitation on the Land Question in a way that was somewhat perplexing. It so happened that a "National Testimonial" had been proposed to Sir John Gray, in consideration of his

* The phrase suggested the title of the article "Wanted a Policy for Ireland," in the number of this REVIEW for April, 1865.

able advocacy of the cause of religious equality; and it followed, through that balmy gift of bland exaggeration, which is not the least of the charms of those enthusiastic epistolary effusions to which Irish authorities delight to give vent on such occasions,—that a sort of vague impression seemed to permeate the air, as if, after all, perhaps it was Sir John Gray who had actually disestablished the Protestant Church. From Sir John Gray, thus, as it were, standing on a broken buttress of the Establishment, in an attitude rather more striking than that of Marius at Carthage—for Carthage was, like the Establishment, the enemy of Rome, but the Church of Ireland was Sir John's own personal and peculiar Church—from Sir John, we say, suddenly broke a loud cry of "Perpetuity and Valuation"! Perpetuity of tenure and valuation of rents was, as the students of Mr. Mill's Political Economy may have learned, the solution of the Irish Land Question proposed by Mr. William Conner,—whom the great philosopher calls, "its earliest, most enthusiastic, and most indefatigable apostle,"—some forty years ago. Never was prophet or apostle less honoured in his own country. Having closely watched all that has been written and said on this subject for the last six months, we cannot recall to memory a single occasion on which Mr. William Conner's name was so much as mentioned. A life of obscurity, and after death utter oblivion—but that his one idea should live to be the thought and the hope of many men—such has been his fate; such, perhaps, may have been the fate, which the quiet and rather grim old man desired. But now his mantle seemed to have fallen on about the last place to which he should have thought that garment would ever have fluttered, the shoulders, to wit, of Sir John Gray. It puzzled the people generally, the old Tenant Leaguers particularly, to find Sir John Gray suddenly declare for perpetuity and valuation. For ever since the cause of tenant right had first been agitated in Ireland, he had been known as by no means a sanguine advocate of those particular principles. He had given hesitating support to the Tenant League as long as they formed a positive part of its programme. After years of unsuccessful agitation, when the propositions of Mr. Sharman Crawford (to whom perpetuity was immolated) were still further reduced to the Bill alluded to in late debates as the Tenant League Bill, Sir John (then Doctor) Gray warmly congratulated Mr. Moore and the League on having discarded the principle of valuation, and even declared that the position of the tenant was much better without it. The Irish peasant's mind is a curious mixture of simplicity and shrewdness. Much meditating amid his insecure acres, and by

his not too happy hearth, he asked himself, "Would Sir John Gray come forward with valuation and perpetuity at this time of day, if he did not see his way to it? Maybe he has had a word, or leastways a wink, from Mr. Gladstone." The priests thought that at all events agitation was better than conspiracy. Through all the circuit of the four seas there awoke the long silent sounds of popular movement. Some counties came to the front first, and some waited to see what others were doing; and the North was last of all. There were preliminary meetings, and the concoction of strong and rotund resolutions exercised at evening the minds of country committees. Orators lying awake at night thought of their theme; and, if conscious of any want of wit, or logic, or language, remembered that of late the faculty of indignation has always gone a great way with Irish assemblies. To Kilkenny's thunder answered Longford, and the peal of Wexford echoing against Vinegar Hill was reverberated through the boulder-strewn vales of farthest Connaught. The farmers of Louth, molested by Fenians, had to take refuge in the Court House, but the Fenians of Limerick scattered the farmers, smashed their platform, and made such a racket that they actually silenced Mr. Synan. The Fenians at first wanted to stop all public meetings, on the score that they wore the character of being peaceful, loyal, moral and constitutional proceedings; but as militant Fenianism in country districts mainly consists of farmers' sons, who are not without the fear of getting thrashed at home in detail for such turbulence, a compromise occurred, and meetings to obtain the release of the Fenian prisoners began and proceeded *pari passu*. The turmoil spread and the din swelled, and the *sæva indignatio*, which had been lacerating the hearts of silent patriots for ever so many years, found vent sometimes in temerarious allusions and in red-hot words. There is a sentence which O'Connell hardly ever made a speech without repeating. He loved all his own axioms, but this particularly—"He who commits a crime gives strength to the enemy." This wise word would have made a good general text for the meetings of last autumn, at some of which speeches were delivered, that (to state the case with all possible charity) were not calculated to contract the area or diminish the temptations to crime.

The conduct of the usual organs of the Irish Conservatives at this time would have been, to a dispassionate student of the art and mystery of manufacturing public opinion, simply bewildering. The *Irish Times*, a journal which aspires to be considered the *Times* of Ireland, and which enjoys a very widely-diffused circulation, declared, in a series of articles and reports

of considerable ability, in favour of a settlement by perpetuity and valuation. The *Daily Express*, the organ of a compact and influential section of the Irish Tories, applauded the almost equivalent proposition of Master Fitzgibbon. It was as if the first evidence of life in the Irish Tories, after the great defeat they had sustained, was a determination not to accept battle again on conditions which could only end in disaster. They did not even seek a middle line. On the other hand, a great opportunity had come to the hand of the Irish Parliamentary Liberals, who had been faithful to their party through fair and foul weather—who had applauded while they writhed under the scoff of Lord Palmerston at the Pope or at Paddy, and who had even obtained the extraordinary grace to be humble under the great tribulation of Sir Robert Peel. Now, after all, their hour had come. Their leader, their party had done the deed—had other deeds to do. The opportunity came to their hand, but it slipped through their fingers. Their principal local leaders had taken office; and office, in Ireland at least, debars men, to a strange degree, from acting directly on public opinion. But those of the Irish Liberals who were free to do as they pleased, did not act as English or Scotch Liberals would, we think, have acted in such circumstances. They did not at once go before their constituents to render account of what had been done, and to suggest in what way their hands should be strengthened for what remained to do. This is not an Irish custom, though it used to be and ought to be. Ireland, however, is proud of her character as a grateful and a hospitable country; and Mr. Gladstone spent good part of the recess within six hours of Dublin. Had he been invited to a grand banquet in the Rotundo, with, let us suppose, the good old Duke, the venerable chief of the Geraldines in the chair, with the first Catholic Chancellor facing the first Irish Cardinal at the board, with, as would certainly have been the case, every county and almost every corporation in the country represented in the audience—had Mr. Gladstone at that moment, and so surrounded, addressed for the first time the Irish people face to face, every word he said would have had, at all events, whatsoever efficacy the eager attention and profound respect of millions of men can give to the words of beneficent genius and power. But the Irish Liberals had long been used to dread the turbulent *mare magnum* of popular movement. They preferred to shrimp in the shallows, and to count with much content what flotsam and jetsam a high tide brought now and then. If one could have got very deep in their confidence, he would probably have found that the grand topic of the hour was the

question whether O'Brief had really any chance of the attorney-generalship of Heligoland, or MacBellows was to be the next viceroy of the Virgin Islands.

A curious assumption, based upon a reference to certain words attributed to Mr. Gladstone, which no one took the trouble of investigating and verifying, gave from the start a certain unreal and falsetto character to the agitation which ensued. It was written in the papers, and said on the platforms, that Mr. Gladstone had promised, when undertaking the charge of Government, that he would govern Ireland according to Irish ideas, or from an Irish point of view, and no otherwise. It is a curious and not insignificant fact that the passage so often cited, but never quoted, was spoken by Mr. Gladstone when the Government to which he belonged was about to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland in 1866. The words had, however, though evidently carefully considered, and definitely limited and guarded, such a very essential and potent meaning, that we ventured to say of them at the time:—"Such are the unhappy circumstances of Ireland, that if Mr. Gladstone will only devote himself to the policy indicated in these words, he may leave a name truly greater in the annals of Imperial statesmanship than that of either Pitt, and as much beloved in Ireland as that of O'Connell."*

These, however, are the exact words:—

For my own part, I will only say that I consider we are a united people, with a common Government, with a complete political incorporation. But we are also a United Kingdom, made up of three nations, welded politically into one, but necessarily, and, in fact, with many distinctions of law, of usage, of character, of history, and of religion. In circumstances such as these there are common questions, which must be administered upon principles common to the whole empire—all those questions in which the interests of the whole overbear and swallow up the interests of the parts. The composition of a Government must be determined, not by domicile or birthplace, but by the competency of those who are chosen to fill office. The levying of taxes in, and the administration of all the public revenue, must be governed by principles applicable to the three kingdoms alike. The general rule in these cases should be alike applicable to all; subject, perhaps, to well-defined exceptions; and if exceptions are made, they should be exceptions, not in favour of any class or party, but in favour of the whole country alike. But there are many other questions with regard to which in England, Scotland, and Ireland, that interest which is especially English, Scotch, or Irish pre-

* DUBLIN REVIEW, art. "Signs of an Irish Policy," April, 1866.

dominates over that which is common, and with regard to the questions falling within that category we ought to apply to Ireland the same principles on which we act in the two other countries, and legislate for them according to the views of the majority of the people of that country.

Now, what is the sense of these words? How do they apply? And how are the views of the majority of the Irish people to be made evident? Mr. Gladstone has been repeatedly urged with great vehemence to release the Fenian prisoners, because such was the wish of the Irish people. But would any candid Fenian condescend to declare that the release of the men still detained is a question in which a local Irish interest predominates over that which is common and Imperial? The Fenians, at all events, knew what they meant, and, so far as they could, said it and did it. They attacked the British empire whenever they could get into contact with it, and struck it from time to time at many salient points. Is Clerkenwell situate in the county Cork? Is Manchester the metropolis of Connaught? One of the best planned enterprizes of the organization was the attempt on Chester Castle. The one occasion on which a Fenian force effectively crossed arms with a British regiment was on the Canadian frontier. The state of London, horrified by the piteous casualties caused by the attempt to release Colonel Burke, was such as no Irish city had occasion to experience. Not in Dublin, but in Quebec, did the foul and dastardly murder of Mr. Darcy McGee, the only stain of its sort on the Irish name, and a stain that will deepen to the end of time, take place. About the same time, at the other end of the globe, happened the attempt on Prince Alfred's life; the act of a solitary maniac undoubtedly, but of a maniac whose madness took its method from the idea that he was acting as the instrument of a powerful conspiracy. In fine, who is ignorant of the extraordinary influence which the Fenian organization exercised on American politics, an influence stedfastly employed to promote a war between the United States and the British Empire? Can it be said that such a contingency is one in which the Irish interest predominates over that which is Imperial? We are glad to believe that the political prisoners who are still detained by the Government will soon be released; but their case has certainly not been served by the extravagant animosity with which an argument so disingenuous in its essence has been pressed on their behalf.

Again, how are the views of the majority of the people of Ireland to be manifested to a minister of state? Is he to

ascertain them from the newspaper which is supposed to have the largest circulation among the most disaffected classes of the population? Is he to skim their sense from the flood of speech poured forth at public meetings? Is there any one public man who can be said to hold the proxy of the four provinces? A minister has obviously one and only one way of ascertaining what is the sense of a people constitutionally governed, and that is through their representatives in Parliament. No one can say that there is not the amplest liberty of exercising the franchise in the country in which took place the late elections for Tipperary and Waterford. If freedom of voting is in any way controlled, it certainly is not any longer by the landlord, except in Ulster, nor by the influence of the administration anywhere; and even in Ulster, were the influence of the landlord withdrawn, the one single simple test would be confidence in Mr. Gladstone. A general election has taken place since his very distinct declaration of policy was made. What has been the result? This session, on the second reading of the Land Bill, some seven or eight not very enthusiastic advocates of valuation and perpetuity went into the same lobby with Sir John Gray, but nine in ten of the Irish members voted with the Government. Is there one of them of any section of opinion—Mr. Moore, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Cogan, Mr. Maguire, Mr. MacEvoy, Mr. Dalway, Mr. De la Poer, The O'Donoghue,—whose seat is in the slightest danger in consequence? Even of the sixty Irish members who voted for the second reading of the Peace Preservation Bill, and the thirty who abstained from voting, of how many can it be seriously said that they have forfeited the confidence of their constituents? If it be so, the usual signs are certainly somewhat slow in appearing. Irish constituencies were wont to be demonstrative enough formerly, when there was question of protesting against a Coercion Bill.

But, for the first time in the history of Ireland, its people with amazement contemplate the fact that there is a Government in office which presents to Parliament at the same moment, and presses with equal energy, both coercive and remedial measures. Hitherto a minister was considered to be excused from proposing the redress of grievances while he could plead that he was engaged in the punishment of crime. This Government has demanded and has obtained coercive powers such as no other Government ever came to Parliament for—powers in regard to the press such as, according to all that has hitherto been understood touching the sanctions of English liberty, no executive ought to be entrusted with, except in the case of actual or imminent civil war. On the other hand, we

do not hesitate to say that the provisions of the Act which affect agrarian crime can hardly be too severe, in mercy to the population of the limited district to which they are applicable. During the months of January and February of the present year, 694 agrarian outrages were reported by the police of all Ireland. In this large number there was, however, only one murder, and only two attempts to murder. There were 134 cases of forcibly levying contributions from the farming classes; 226 of administering unlawful oaths; 214 of intimidation by threatening letters; and two-thirds of all these wretched offences occurred in one county. All the cases of levying contributions were in the county of Mayo, also 203 out of the 226 cases of administering unlawful oaths, and 81 of the number of threatening letters. What Government dare allow such a state of social anarchy to spread? If the Green Flag instead of the Union Jack hung over Dublin Castle, and if old King Brian of the Tributes was governing the country instead of Earl Spencer, who can doubt how that stern dispenser of strict justice would deal with such a flagitious outburst of utter ruffianism? Order would be restored in Mayo within a month, were it necessary to set up a gallows on every hill and a whipping-post at every cross-road. The evil to be dealt with is a sort of squalid brigandage, which terrifies and preys upon the poor and unprotected. It is mere mercy to them to put it down promptly and sharply, and the ordinary law is obviously ineffectual for that purpose. But within the domain of the ordinary law live, and will continue to live, from twenty to thirty of the thirty-two Irish counties. Ulster is almost free from agrarian crime; Munster is at this moment the most peaceable of all the provinces; Mayo, Sligo, and Leitrim, in Connaught, and parts of King's and Queen's Counties, and of Meath and Cavan, are probably the only districts to which it will be necessary to apply the extraordinary powers granted by Parliament.

But the powers granted in regard to the National Press are of a totally different character, and ought never to have been combined with the provision taken against agrarian disorders. They are absolutely unconstitutional powers. We are aware that the word "constitutional" is a word out of date with modern Liberals; but this only proves what has been sometimes suspected, that modern Liberals do not understand what liberty means, and only understand that the rule of a Liberal majority is the one rule of right. It is of ill omen that at the same time the French Government abdicates the power of suppressing the *Marseillaise*, the Irish Government is impelled to take powers to enable it to suppress the *Flag of Ireland* or

the *Weekly News*. But the French Government, when it relinquished the power of *avertissement*, resumed the practice of prosecution; and in consequence M. Rochefort and half his staff are at present in Saint Pélagie. It may be said, and it is probably true, that if the Irish Government were to do likewise, Dublin juries having a rather pronounced tendency to convict national journalists, Richmond prison would not want its series of literary tenants. Whether the journalists could really suffer more under one system or the other will depend of course on the administration of the new Act.

But as this law is law, and will so remain for at least a limited time in Ireland, what, it may be asked, is the duty of the national journalist in its regard? His duty is unhappily dictated by necessity. He must obey it or cease to live in his present capacity. Accordingly, he will of course obey it. But he may well ask himself in doing so, whether, even if no such law were in the statute book, the circumstances of the country at present warrant, we will not say treasonable or seditious, but even inflammatory and rancorous language, such as one reads now and then in the pages of the *National Press*. The party which founded a *National Press* in Ireland, the party of *Young Ireland*, was accustomed to guide its conduct by rules of policy, and was proud of keeping itself free from the coarseness of popular passion. It had its faults, but it did not attorn to the rabble. The spirit of its founders, its first and wisest leaders, of Charles Gavan Duffy, of Thomas Davis, of John Dillon, was above all things a constructive and a conciliatory spirit, which resisted "the mob's dictation" as zealously as arbitrary power, and in the task it set to itself of "training up a troubled nation," above all things, and always, strove to fulfil the noble words of its prophet and its guide, him whose name those who knew him can still hardly name without tears:—

In tempting wealth and trying woe,
In struggling with a mob's dictation,
In bearing back a foreign foe,
In training up a troubled nation,
Still hold to Truth, abound in Love,
Rejecting every base compliance,
Your praise within, your prize above,
And live and die in Self-Reliance.

When the *Young Ireland* party was formed, there had been no Irish rebellion since 1798. Since, there have been two attempts at insurrection in Ireland—the first a flash in the pan, the second a wretched stampede. On each occasion, a handful

of leaders showed heroic courage, bore the ruinous penalties that overtook them with a cheerful heart, and, above all, were patient with the people, who, when the hour had come, *would not rise*. The insurrections failed utterly ; but a certain vapouring about insurrection always goes on ; and the result has been that the Irish nation throughout the world, throughout Western Europe certainly, is losing its old character as a nation of prompt and chivalrous courage, and of a natural sense of unity and discipline, and is supposed to have degenerated into a vain and turbulent populace, which steeps its brain in dreams of rebellion, which craves from poets and journalists a literature that stimulates like a dram, but which, nevertheless, will not fight —will not at all events fight in the way that Frenchmen, and Poles, and Italians undertake to fight when they go in for insurrection. “A conquered nation,” said Father Faber, “is a tiresome spectacle, but never is it so disheartening as when it is tossing in unhelpful and inefficacious sedition, without rising to the heroism of a crusade for freedom.” Wiser words were never uttered. If one, who has always had the honour of the Irish national press much at heart, may presume to offer a word of advice to its conductors in this momentous hour, he would say to them that this is a time in which they not merely must, through major force, but may with great advantage to the real basis of their power, endeavour to wean their readers of this unhealthy craving for unhelpful and inefficacious sedition. Irish Nationalists either ultimately contemplate an Irish rebellion or they do not. The separation of Ireland from England by rebellion was, in 1798, a feasible military operation. In 1848, all insurgents seemed to succeed against troops for a time. We do not discuss the question of moral right in regard to either occasion. But now assuredly it may be absolutely said that there is neither moral right nor material chance for an insurrectionary policy in Ireland. No insurrection in Ireland could hold its ground for a week against England, even if England were at war with America, without somewhat the same superiority in certain conditions of force that the Southern States had at the beginning of the war with the North ; and in particular it is obvious that the Irish insurgents should start with the possession of a more numerous, a lighter, and better-served artillery than that possessed by the English Government, with an active and enterprising cavalry, and a general as superior to Lord Strathnairn as General Lee was to General Pope. Otherwise, England being already sure of Ulster, and holding Dublin without the least trouble by mere pressure from the sea, would be able to occupy the rich midland plains full of supplies with hardly an effort, and

would thrust the war at once behind the Shannon, or scatter it among the mountains. The character of the country is such throughout the whole central district of the island as not to give any chance of battle to undisciplined troops. In this respect the Southern States had a great advantage in their being so long able to maintain the struggle, in the sinuous and wooded valleys of Virginia; but the interior of Ireland is like a big bowling-green. The war of plains is no doubt the grand war; but it cannot be fought without cannon, and cavalry, and great generals. Everything concerning the military conditions of insurrection has changed within a few years. Even a Paris mob quails now at the name of the Chassepot. The new artillery, the new rifle, have multiplied a hundredfold the power of disciplined troops acting against mere masses of men. All the new mechanical forces of steam and lightning immensely increase the ordinary power of Governments. In Ireland there is only one disciplined native force—the constabulary,—and it is at least as loyal as the Coldstream Guards. Why, then, sustain a sort of vague and furibund insurrectionary spirit in a country which, twice within the memory of yet middle-aged men, fair opportunity offering, has refused point-blank to fight; and which, even if it had the will, has not the skill nor the dynamic energy to sustain a campaign of a month against the force of England? Every Irishman, and especially every Irish Nationalist, of sense and spirit who contemplates the state of French politics at present must feel a genuine contempt and aversion for the character of the “irreconcilable” politician of that country, who, with a government which has given to its people twenty years of prosperity and glory, and which is now according to it the fullest measure of self-government, revels in unreasoning animosity and loathsome personalities. Such are the scions of Voltaire. Not such should they be who inherit the glory and the teaching of Edmund Burke and Henry Grattan, of Daniel O’Connell and Thomas Davis. That “irreconcilable” type of character is certainly not indigenous to the nature of the Irish people—a nature patient in adversity, forgiving of injury on the least atonement, and just against itself with that justice of conscience which is especially formed by the Catholic Church. Is no honour, then, due to England and Scotland for the earnestness, the humility, and the energy with which the majority of men in both countries have sustained, and still sustain, Mr. Gladstone in his great enterprise? For what wrong their fathers did, do they not offer the amplest reparation? No longer as a “foreign foe,” no longer as the patron and promoter of domestic oppression

does England now approach Ireland, but as one who, responsible for a great wrong, desires to make the uttermost amends. In fine, we know no men so bound by every consideration of honour, consistency, and policy to recognize this new order as the writers of the Irish National Press. A period of twenty years has now elapsed since Mr. Gavan Duffy, having, through God's mercy, escaped the fate which befell so many of his comrades, revived the *Nation* newspaper. The programme of policy which he issued in its first number was adopted by the wisest and best men of the party—both those who remained in Ireland and those who were in exile,—and we know of none issued since which has the same right to be regarded as declaring the true means and ends of the Irish Nationalist. It disowned frankly all insurrectionary projects. It proposed to restore moral and physical force to the people, by abolishing religious ascendancy and achieving security of tenure. It advocated an alliance with the party of movement in England. To those who still spoke of rebellion, Mr. Duffy addressed these simple words, which, if they were true after Ballingarry, are surely of tenfold truth after Tallaght:—

If the struggle is to be renewed, for what object is it to be renewed? And by what ways and means? I answer without hesitation that the struggle to win our independence by arms cannot be taken up now. All bluster and bravado are more repulsive and mournful to me than a death-bell. They sound more falsely, more offensively, than even the glosses of simulated loyalty. It is true that no man can presume to fix limits to the endurance of a nation, or to bar its rights of resistance,—and God forbid that I should try to do so; but to me, who am not ignorant of any part of what has been done or attempted since February, '48, nothing is more certain than that Ireland is not prepared to walk in that path, and that it is a mischievous and misleading falsehood to pretend that she is. For nations have generally an alternative, and it is only by choosing neither course that they perish. . . The people who might, could, would, or should have fought for their freedom and did not fight, must drop the language of war and be content with the means that remain.

What these means were, and to what ends they should be applied, he stated with the succinct intensity which belonged to his language, and we ask the Irish National journalists of to-day, some of whom at least are proud to have been his disciples, whether the policy proposed by Mr. Gavan Duffy in 1849 is not absolutely identical with the policy of Mr. Gladstone in 1870?

To me it appears that time and circumstances have conspired to open another opportunity for Ireland, wonderfully providential, considering all we

have lost and wasted. I seem to discern straight before us the identical ground on which a successful battle may still be fought, if we have sense to occupy and use it wisely and soberly. Our first practical effort ought to be to bring back Ireland to health and strength, by stopping the system of extermination; by giving security of tenure to the people; by plucking down the sectarian ascendancy that separates the Irish people into two hostile camps; by purifying the popular representation, and occupying with wise men, and for wise and generous purposes, the institutions which the country still possesses. And for such a contest circumstances, I repeat, are singularly propitious.

What these circumstances were he stated in detail. One of the first was this :—

At lowest, there are unquestionably more powerful Englishmen who honestly desire to help us than we could reckon at any former time—a fact not without significance and not without importance, though Heaven smiles only on those who help themselves.

And then, in words that certainly seemed extravagantly sanguine at the time, but which, in the brief space of twenty years, have proved to be an accurate prophecy, he continued :—

I believe Ireland and England want to see the oligarchy shorn of their inordinate powers, and a substantial basis for liberty laid in the formation of a small proprietary.

I believe a powerful English party are anxious to pull down the English Church in Ireland as a glaring and monstrous wrong, and I know it is a well-head of bitterness and animosity among Irishmen, which has long retarded and forbidden their fusion. . . .

I know that the union of the movement parties in the two countries is the only thing, except armed revolution, which will ensure success for either of these measures, and I desire such a union for such a purpose. . . .

A liberated Irish people could not call more impatiently for the abatement of this reign of darkness and death than a powerful party in England begin to demand it. Ireland, feverish and distracted at this moment, will by-and-by take up the demand with an unexpected and emphatic vigour. The ravages of depopulation heal rapidly when the vital heat of Hope returns; and I do not fear that her wounds are mortal. On the contrary, I believe she is already tossing in that tumultuous and prolific agony which precedes a new birth. The popular parties in the two countries are turning their eyes in the same direction, and *will by-and-by be pressing in the same breach. And thus God's justice, which still rules the world, though it will not work out its ends by our methods, but by its own, prepares another path for Ireland out of the land of bondage.*

The path is open. Who shall turn the people's steps away from it? Shall it be said that the policy of the National

VOL. XIV.—NO. XXVIII. [*New Series.*] 2 K

party in 1849 triumphs, after twenty years of gloom and storm, at the last, in spite of unreasonable opposition and misrepresentation on the part of those who ought to be its guardians and its advocates?

To assume an attitude of irreconcilable opposition, would therefore, it seems to us, be a flagrant inconsistency, a grotesque blunder, and a grievous crime. On the other hand, the national journalist is quite within his right when he says that it is the old policy of his party which has triumphed in the abolition of religious ascendancy, and which is vindicated in every division that establishes security of tenure, and renders extermination henceforth practically impossible. So may he at this moment most fairly make, not merely a virtue, but a victory of necessity. To challenge suspension through the new law would be alike unreasonable and unpatriotic. It would be to put himself elaborately in the wrong.

What, in fact, however, is his position as regards the execution of this law? The way in which Irish politics have been conducted since the disestablishment of the Protestant Church, has not been creditable to the country, nor to any party in it. Its public opinion has exhibited an unwarrantable heat and impatience. That heat and impatience have been followed by, and have appeared to act as, the cause and provocation of an immense amount of low crime. At the same time, it must be said that Ireland never had a more capable and gentle administration. In the long line of Irish Viceroy, there has not been a more upright, painstaking, and conscientious Lord-Lieutenant than Earl Spencer. No Irishman has ever occupied the office of Chief Secretary, who was so specially qualified to interpret the wants and wishes of his country to the general government of the empire as Mr. Fortescue, or who has had so clear a knowledge of, and so keen a sympathy with, the broad interests of the population; or in whom office has developed such high and humane statesmanlike qualities. When the Chancellor, a man whose praise is on the lips of all men, and every step in whose career has been associated with some act of devotion to his race and his religion, was raised to the woolsack, what Irish Catholic was there who did not feel that the high seat of justice had never been more worthily filled since Moran wore the collar of gold? To add to the difficulties which such an executive has had to encounter in carrying out the great act of state of last year, and in preparing for the almost greater task of this, was not, on the whole, the work of wise patriots.

The Land Bill is passing through Committee in the House of Commons while we write, and it may seem hasty to express

a definite judgment as to the effect which its provisions may have in satisfying the hopes of the Irish tenantry. But the divisions already taken have so absolutely affirmed some of its most important and disputable principles, especially the force of local customs, and the right to damages for disturbance of occupancy, that it can hardly be doubted the measure will pass through that House in its integrity, and will go to the Lords with all the weight which the authority of the Commons expressed on every important point by great majorities commands.

It is, we do not hesitate to affirm, the largest, the most liberal, and the justest measure ever proposed to Parliament in the interest of the Irish tenantry; and is distinctly superior, when viewed as a complete scheme, to the Bill of Mr. Sharman Crawford, and to the later Bill of the Tenant League. There is of course no sort of comparison between it and the measures proposed by successive Governments from the time when Lord Stanley to the time when Lord Mayo was Chief Secretary. "Its three pillars," as Mr. Gladstone described them in the debate of the 5th inst., are, first, the confirmation of Irish customs; second, the rule that improvements made by the tenant shall be the property of the tenant; and third, the principle that the tenant shall receive damages on eviction. But in addition, it contains provision for the gradual formation of a small proprietary on terms of loan from the State, not illiberal as they stand, but which can and will probably be improved. It also provides an effective remedy at law against exorbitant increase of rent. It provides for the landlord but one way of relieving himself from the uncertain pressure of the new powers given to the tenant, and that is by enlarging the tenant's security of tenure. It utterly reverses the presumption of law, which a hundred statutes had established in the landlord's favour, and definitively transfers it to the side of the tenant. It contains such effective remedies against oppression, that it may be said to place the bad landlord to a considerable degree in his tenant's power; and while it will make the minimum of change on properties which have hitherto been justly and liberally administered, its tendency will be to make it the mutual interest of landlord and tenant that their dealings shall be fair, open, and above-board, and their disputes settled, whenever any may arise, through the large authority given to tribunals of arbitration. In the words of Mr. Gavan Duffy, already quoted, it will "bring back Ireland to health and strength by stopping the system of extermination, and by giving security of tenure to the people." Had it been law when he wrote these words, such sweeping

evictions as Mr. Shirley's in Farney, or Lord Lucan's, or those in Clare, of which Sir Robert Peel so indignantly spoke, or as those of a more recent date effected by Lord Sligo, and attempted by Mr. Scully, simply could not have happened. The work would have been far too costly. How many murders might have been prevented ! How much wholesale plunder of the property, and banishment of the persons of honest and pious people ! How should Fenianism have spread through the country had 600,000 tenant-farmers felt themselves vitally interested in its prosperity, and therefore in its peace ? If, when this Bill becomes law, there be one tenant in Ireland who does not acquire or achieve Security of Tenure, it will assuredly have been, or will be, his own fault. Its provisions set a high premium on industry and energy, past, present, and future. But no law can protect idleness and improvidence. The "rights of property," which hitherto in Ireland have only related invidiously to the possessions of one class, will rapidly be so extended that they shall come to mean the sanction of thrift and labour in every cabin in the land. That such a law should be complicated is only another way of saying that it is equitable and comprehensive. That it was meant to make any invidious distinction between the Protestant of the north and the Catholic of the south is one of the grossest calumnies uttered in the course of that campaign of ignorant and mendacious declamation which has been urged against it ; the simple answer to such a statement is, that the Catholic tenant-farmers of Ulster exceed by 14,000 the Protestant and Presbyterian tenant-farmers added together. That it may lead to much litigation for a time we cannot deny, and we shall not affect to regret. Good landlords will settle what disputes they may have with their tenants under the arbitration clause. Bad landlords must be allowed to make the precedents, which extend the boundaries of the statute, knowing, as they well know beforehand, that the Irish courts are weary of being obliged to "administer injustice." Under the cover of the new presumptions, a strong body of case-law will doubtless gradually grow. If, meantime, the exacting landlord is handed over to the attentions of the attorney, he is, at least it may be suggested, in proportion released from those of the assassin. It is no rash prophecy to say that agrarian crime must cease and come to an end in Ireland ; and that within a very few years, that portion of its population which has hitherto been the most utterly unprotected by the law, will be the most law-loving and -abiding people on the face of the earth ; for the Irish peasantry are, notwithstanding all the stains and weaknesses which long

oppression and hard usage have left on their character, a noble, a pious, and a grateful race, loving justice with a love as strong as the hatred with which they hate iniquity. Despite the present confusion and conflict which rage high over the heads of the people, we look forward with assured and undoubting confidence to the time when it shall be known throughout the four provinces, while the next harvest is being reaped, that this Bill has become law. To every farmer in the land it will at once extend a boon and a security; and, as it seems to us, it is so framed as to extend the exact measure of advantage and security which each man will feel that his honesty and industry have merited. Thus the law will at last have come home as a sovereign pledge of right and of hope to the peasant's hearth, no longer the sentence of doom that only knew how to stifle its cheerful blaze. Then shall he feel that his sweat sinks not into the ground in vain, and that he may never more know the wrongs that bring the temptation of blood. Justice shall be to him as a boundary-wall, and the free field respond to his fruitful labours; and if indeed the poet's dream should ever be realized, of that land where at last—

The common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law,

it may well be among this goodly people.

With religious ascendancy abolished, with a just Land Law in active and widening operation, the great sources of disaffection and of alienation will have been closed. The Education Question comes next in order of time and of importance, and its discussion will doubtless occupy a prominent place in the debates of next Session. But that question is already in some degree resolved by the force of facts. A secular scheme with a conscience clause has been tried in Ireland for the space of a whole generation; and it has failed. The National System has become and is becoming every year more and more of a distinct denominational system. If, on this question, the minister is bound to respect "the views of the majority of the people," then his course is clear, as there is no minority to be polled. The Irish Protestant equally with the Irish Catholic insists upon a religious education of the people. The efforts of a knot of obscurantist professors, interested in the maintenance of the Queen's Colleges, and influential with a few of the London editors, may lead for a while to the supposition that there is a substantial party in Ireland in favour of the indifferentist system of education; but the Irish nation has always had a lively horror of ideologues; and if it is asked nowa-

days to choose between the law as laid down by priests and the law as laid down by professors, it will answer that that cause was finished so long ago in its history as the time of S. Columb-kille. It long ago chose the priest for its guide in this province of thought, and it has not regretted its choice. In its history, religion and education have always gone hand in hand. S. Patrick taught his people the alphabet and the Decalogue together. The Irish monastery, wherever its site, at S. Gall or at Donegal, was the home of learning as well as of piety. The same penal laws tried to strike the primer from the schoolmaster's, and the chalice from the priest's hands; and now Ireland will hardly stultify its whole history, and stunt its progress, in consideration of the penitence of Trinity College and the nihilist zeal of Mr. Fawcett. The time, at all events, we sincerely hope, is at hand when the National schoolmaster will no longer be paraded before Parliament as the well-known Fenian Centre and the amanuensis in ordinary of the Riband Lodge.

Much, even after the Education question has been settled, will remain to be achieved in the field of Irish government and administration. There is a large, but not a very difficult labour before the Irish Secretary, in the readjustment of the administration of the Poor Law—which had been provided to meet the wants of a population of eight millions, of whom a fourth received relief in one year, and is out of all proportion to the real necessities of a population of five millions, from which pauperism has to a great extent sloughed away. The cost is inordinate—the moral effect depressing. It is, we submit, a legitimate object of Irish policy to see that two-thirds of the workhouses shall be let as factories or turned into Industrial Schools. The railway system of the country will, there is good reason to hope, be consolidated and extended under State direction; and in Ireland there is little doubt that the State can interpose to effect an amalgamation of the present companies without risk of loss and with very great public benefit. There is much to be done for the development of the long-wasted natural resources of the country, which the State may be fairly expected to assist; much which industry invigorated by security will spontaneously achieve. The Irish river must be aided to keep to his own channel, and to take tribute besides from the bog. The brown turf will all in time turn to green, and the forests far-famed of old clothe the bare hills again, and the rich beet will encroach more and more on the province of the potato, and the industry of Ulster will spread with its tenant right over

the other provinces, and Irish fishermen will at last learn to catch Irish fish.

But behind all, the problem of problems remains. Is it possible to blend the sentiment of nationality with the sentiment of loyalty in Ireland as in Scotland? England has learned even to take pride in the Scotch plaid, but as yet has only contumely for the wearing of the green. England loves to see her Highland volunteers march past in their tartan, but in Ireland there must be no volunteers, whether in green or orange. Who shall answer for the heart of a nation, the heart of a nation which is its nationality? We do not pretend to do so. But the immediate future to which we look forward in Ireland is one of peaceful industry, and of a grateful calm. The generation which has attained so miraculously to religious liberty and to the long-sought securities of the soil, will certainly not conspire, and will hardly agitate. Its first duty will be, as it were, to take possession of its own country, to develop its resources, and to repair the ravages of the past. But it may safely be said that whatever the future may have in store for either people, the bitter hatred of England, the result of centuries of misrule, must swiftly pass away; for the Irish nation has already learned that just laws can come from the free will of a British Parliament; and through all time the figure of one great Englishman will stand between them and the evil images of the past—he whose first use of supreme power was to give them happy homes and altars free, who in so short a time, by the sole force of his genius and his will, reversed the course of centuries of cruel policy, and for ever blotted out from the page of their history “the curse of Cromwell.”

ART. IX.—CONTROVERSIES ON THE COUNCIL.

The “Vatican”: a Weekly Record of the Council.

Letters in the “Weekly Register.” By Very Rev. HERBERT VAUGHAN, D.D.;
Rev. JOHN NARY; Rev. J. G. WENHAM; Rev. Dr. TODD, &c. &c.

WHEN first Pius IX. summoned his Ecumenical Council, the English Protestant journals affected supreme scorn for the whole proceeding, though sufficiently indicating by their tone their anxiety and annoyance. But since the Council has assembled, they have entirely dropped the mask of indifference; and have thrown themselves heart and soul into what they represent as a conflict between the “Ultramontanes” and the “Opposition.” We cannot be surprised that their whole

sympathy is with the latter. In the first place their natural anti-Catholic instinct tells them on which side lies the true interest of the Roman Catholic Church; and we often wonder e. g. how so excellent a prelate as Mgr. Dupanloup, who has so long been honoured by their antipathy, can bear to find himself the object of their revolting praise. But over and above this, to Protestant journalists the Church's constitution is a *terra incognita*. What they are familiar with is the idea of a limited monarchy; or (in other words) the idea of some king summoning a legislature, which, when it has met, possesses practically superior authority to his own. It is not very surprising therefore that they regard the Pope as guilty of preposterous usurpation, when he acts on Catholic principles: when he acts on the dogma, that he is no less simply supreme whether a Council may or may not happen to be sitting; that Christ has given him authority, not only over priests and laymen, but (no less) over bishops whether dispersed or assembled.

Then there is a further fact, of which these journalists have apparently not the faintest suspicion. They invariably speak as though the dogma of Papal infallibility were as yet confessedly an open one in the Roman Catholic Church. But the Holy See has always judged otherwise. Successive Pontiffs have indeed tolerated Gallicanism, considering its toleration to be on the whole a less evil than the excommunication of its adherents. But they have ever regarded the infallibility of their See as an indubitably revealed truth, nay as the very foundation of the Church's whole teaching authority; and they have ever assumed such infallibility in their whole series of official acts. Yet one Protestant scribe assails Pius IX. for having indulgenced a prayer which professes this dogma; and another censures him for having written in the same sense to Mgr. Ségur: both journalists labouring apparently under sublimest ignorance of the fact, that these are but conspicuous exhibitions of a principle, on which the Holy See has undeviatingly acted from first to last.

It is no matter of opinion then, but a Catholic verity always assumed as such by the Holy See, that when the Pontiff thinks it expedient to surround himself with his divinely given counsellors the Catholic Episcopate, he does not thereby cease to be the supreme and infallible earthly "teacher of all Christians." It is for him exclusively to decide—and so he explained in the "*Multiplices inter*"—on what particulars he desires the Council's advice: and though he has not only permitted but exhorted the assembled Fathers to make any spontaneous suggestion for the Church's benefit, it rests with himself to determine whether such suggestions shall be submitted to the Council. All this would no doubt be a tyrannical usurpa-

tion, if he were a limited monarch dealing with a sovereign Parliament; but since he is a Pope teaching and ruling, even while he solicits the judgment of, an Œcumenical Council,—the “tyrannical usurpation” could only be attributed to those (if any there were) who should seek to impede the exercise of his divinely given prerogatives.

As to the particular facts on which Protestant journalists base their comments, we need not say how simply unworthy these facts are of reliance. The Fathers of the Council must not divulge what does take place there: but they are at full liberty to declare what does *not*; and the correspondents of English newspapers are quite notorious at Rome for their ludicrous misrepresentations. At the same time, although the facts authentically known are not very numerous, some of them quite suffice to bear out inferences of considerable importance. It is no conciliar secret, that more than five hundred bishops have signed one or other postulatium entreating a definition of Pontifical infallibility;* nor is it any conciliar secret that some hundred and twenty have signed a counter-postulatium. Now let our readers bear in mind—we will not merely say F. Gratry’s incredibly shallow and violent assaults on the Holy See—but Dr. Döllinger’s profoundly anti-Catholic utterances. If these be remembered, it will seem plain that those bishops who, with such documents before them, still consider the infallibility definition inopportune, differ unspeakably in the practical appreciation of facts from the large majority of their brethren. Again the venerable Bishop of Laval has published a letter, which speaks in most emphatic language of the mischief done by Mgr. Dupanloup and his friends. All this makes it extremely probable, that on the matters already discussed in Council—the schemata concerning rationalism and discipline—the differences of opinion have been by no means merely subordinate and (as it were) verbal, but that a very grave conflict of practical judgment has been exhibited. On the other hand everything points to the conclusion, that in *doctrine* there has been very little divergence. Even on the critical question of Papal infallibility, the whole discussion turns on *opportuneness*; for those bishops who assail the dogma itself can only be counted by units.† And

* The Bishop of Saint Denis de la Réunion mentions, in his condemnation of F. Gratry, that “*six hundred* bishops of the Council, in the full exercise of their liberty, have signed the Postulatium” for a definition. So states the “Vatican” of March 18th.

† Two bishops indeed have written to F. Gratry, expressing agreement with his first deplorable pamphlet; but *only* two are recorded to have done so. Moreover one of these has since expressed to the Holy Father his sincere regret for what he had done.

this is that statement of Archbishop Manning's, which has been so absurdly criticised. There has been no important difference of *doctrine* in the Council—so he said in effect—but there has been the very gravest difference of practical judgment.

The most trustworthy comment however which we can possibly place before our readers on the present aspect of affairs, will be the Holy Father's very remarkable letter to Mgr. Ségur.

Beloved Son, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

Your labours and your writings have no other object but the service of the Church and the advancement of religion, as your letter so full of submission and respect signally testifies. It is on this account that the presentation of your recent work on the Council has been especially agreeable to Us. Nothing indeed can be more useful than to place before men just ideas with respect to it, and to point out the folly of the monstrous prejudices excited every day in their minds with so much art.

As to the perturbations which afflict you, they occasion Us no uneasiness. Is it a matter of surprise that the powers of darkness, vanquished on every occasion when the whole Church is united together against them, should at this moment array all their forces against the Council now assembled?

Perceiving that the plots devised by wicked men do not suffice to accomplish their designs, they now lay snares even for those whose dispositions are upright; they seek to create division in their opinions, so as at least to derive advantage from the evils which dissension begets; to keep matters in suspense; and thus to retard as long as possible the fatal blow, which they know they cannot escape.

But the virtue of the Holy Spirit is with the Fathers of the Sacred Council. This Divine Spirit assists and guides by His inspiration* the Bishops gathered together in the name of Jesus Christ around His Vicar. For this reason We do not for an instant doubt that the very artifices of the enemy will turn, sooner or later, to the glory of God, the profit of the Church, and the greater good of souls.

Let us call to mind, that Peter was reproved for having doubted when he began to sink; and let us combat with all the more energy, and pray with more faith and perseverance, when the condition of things seems to us to become more critical.

With this object We solicit for you with all Our heart the abundance of Divine grace, and as a pledge of this favour, and a testimony of Our special goodwill towards you, We give you with fervent love the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, the 22nd of January, 1870, in the 24th year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS IX. Pope.

* We may point out by the way, that the Holy Father himself here uses that word "inspiration," which we were lately criticised for adopting in the same sense. See p. 223, note, of our last number.

We think our readers will agree with us, that the "division" of "opinions," here mentioned by the Holy Father, appears from his context to be, as we have said, very grave difference of practical judgment, rather than discrepancy of doctrinal view. And if Catholics would learn in what spirit to contemplate this difference, Pius IX.'s Letter will be their safest possible guide.

What ground then have Protestant journalists for their swaggering talk, about an "organized opposition," and an "anti-Papal reaction"? An almost unprecedented number of bishops have assembled from every portion of the Church. It is found that, with hardly an exception, they all account the Pope infallible in his *ex cathedrâ* teachings; and moreover that the large majority of them consider it not only opportune but even necessary, to define that infallibility as of faith. On the other hand a number, much less than one-quarter of the whole, consider that such a definition would be inopportune at the present moment; and otherwise differ from the majority, on very important matters of practical judgment. They feel so strongly indeed on these practical questions, that their numerous addresses have much retarded the Council's progress, and even necessitated a change in the Council's rules of procedure. But then the Pope had himself solicited them to express freely their opinions; and the differences which have emerged turn almost exclusively on considerations of expediency. Never has the doctrinal unity of the *Ecclesia Docens* been more emphatically exhibited; while from none of the bishops has one disloyal word proceeded in regard to the Holy Father. How such facts as these can afford any ground of triumph to Protestants, we must profess ourselves wholly unable to understand.

We should add that the Catholic newspapers have done their duty admirably, in showing up such misstatements as those on which we have commented. And we should particularly mention the very effective exposures which have been put forth weekly by our admirable contemporary, "*The Vatican*."

So much on Protestant controversies concerning the Council. Those carried on in the Catholic newspapers have turned, as might have been expected, on different questions altogether. Some correspondents e.g. have maintained, that Catholics act unbecomingly in petitioning for a definition of Pontifical infallibility; because, so it is argued, such petitioning is in fact a kind of dictation to the Council, and assumes that laymen understand the Church's interest better than do Pope and bishops. Others have gone even further; and have actually laid down, that the Pope's infallibility cannot be considered an absolutely certain verity, until it shall have been enforced by the Church

as of faith. As this latter view is the more extreme of the two, we will begin with its consideration. And we trust we shall not give offence to such excellent priests as Mr. Nary and Mr. Wenham, if we frankly express our opinion on the matter. It is this. We maintain that no one, who adverts duly to facts, who is able to understand their bearing, and who will steadily look them in the face, can—without intolerable disrespect to the *Ecclesia Docens*—allow a moment's doubt to possess his mind on the fundamental dogma in question.

We will not here recapitulate the proofs repeatedly adduced, on the prominent exhibition of this dogma in Scripture and in the records of Antiquity: on this head we will content ourselves with the testimony of Suarez, whom Bossuet accounts as in some sense a representative of the whole post-Tridentine "schola." Suarez (*de Fide*, d. 5, s. 3, n. 22) declares it "erroneous" to doubt that this dogma is certain *de fide*.* Observe, Suarez does not only consider it "erroneous" to deny *the dogma*; he considers it "erroneous" to deny that the dogma is "*certain de fide*." The very strong similar expressions of Canus, Bellarmine, S. Alphonsus, have been cited by F. Vaughan in his admirable letters to the "Weekly Register"; which have been remarkable at once for their great strength of argument, and for their singularly Christian and temperate tone under circumstances of extreme provocation.†

For ourselves however, we will dwell exclusively on the Acts of Pius IX. now happily reigning, and on the assent given them by the Episcopate. And at starting we would press on our reader's notice the important circumstance, that Pontifical infallibility is *either* a revealed dogma, *or* a deadly error radically subversive of the Church's divinely given constitution. If some one indeed chooses to say that infallibility is exercised, not by the Pope *apart from* bishops, but by the Pope *in union* with those bishops who adhere to his teaching—we should only complain, that the dogma of Pontifical infallibility is expressed by him in so roundabout a way. But let it be supposed for a moment that Mgr. Maret's doctrine e.g. were true; that the Episcopate were endowed with infallibility *apart* from the Pope; that the Pope were under an obligation of sub-

* "*Ausus est Rogerus respondere non esse de fide certum Pontificem deficientem sine Concilio Generali non posse errare. Sed est responsio non solum nimis temeraria sed erronea.*"

† The epithet "aggressive" has been applied to such writers as F. Vaughan. Now he has spoken much less strongly than Suarez and Bellarmine have spoken: and yet he has been severely reprehended for no other offence, than that of partially repeating the statements of those great theologians. On which side then lies the "aggression"? on F. Vaughan's side or on that of his critics?

mitting his doctrinal judgment to that of the Episcopate. If this had really been the institution of Christ, all upholders of Papal infallibility would be simply rebels against that tribunal which Christ has set up; they would dethrone legitimate authority from its rule over their own conscience, and raise up an usurping intruder on its ruins. In other words—as we have said—if the dogma of Pontifical infallibility be not divinely revealed, it is a deadly error radically subversive of the Church's divinely given constitution.

We proceed then to draw out our argument, derived from Pius IX.'s Acts and their episcopal acceptance. These begin with his very elevation to the Pontificate; for in his inaugural Encyclical he addressed to the bishops of Christendom this truly golden exposition of doctrine:—

God Himself has constituted a living authority to teach and establish the true and legitimate sense of His heavenly revelation, and to settle by an infallible judgment all controversies in matters of faith and morals, lest the faithful be “carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, according to the contrivance of error.” This living and infallible authority is to be found in that Church only which,—having been built by Christ our Lord upon Peter, the head, prince, and pastor of the whole Church, whose faith He promised should never fail,—has always had its legitimate Pontiffs, deducing without interruption their origin from Peter, seated in Peter's chair, heirs and guardians of Peter's doctrine, dignity, honour, and power. And since where Peter is there is the Church (S. Ambros. in Psalm xl.), and Peter speaks through the Roman Pontiff (Concil. Chalced. Act. 2), and always in his successors lives and exercises judgment (Synod. Ephes. Act. 3), and bestows on those who seek it the truth of faith (S. Peter. Chrysol. Epist. ad Eutych.), therefore the Divine utterances are to be taken in that precise sense which was and is held by this Roman chair of Blessed Peter, which, as the mother and teacher (*magistra*) of all the Churches (Concil. Trid. Sess. VII. de Bapt.), has ever preserved whole and inviolate the faith delivered by Christ, and has taught it to the faithful, showing to all the way of salvation and the doctrine of uncorrupted truth.

Pius IX. does not indeed here expressly state the infallibility of all *ex cathedrâ* Pontifical definitions; but his words manifestly *point* to that doctrine, and to a still wider doctrine also.* Moreover this Encyclical was received with acclamation by the whole Catholic episcopal body, nor was one solitary voice raised up in the way of dissent or protest. Supposing then that Pontifical infallibility were not a revealed dogma, it would follow, that the Supreme Pontiff addressed the whole Church in words which most strongly suggest a deadly error radically subversive of the

* See our last number, pp. 197-8.

Church's divinely given constitution; and that no solitary episcopal voice was raised up in defence of the constitution thus insidiously assailed. But such a supposition, as is at once manifest to all true Catholics, involves an utterly intolerable disrespect to the *Ecclesia Docens*.

No long period elapsed, before Pius IX. exercised, in the most prominent and emphatic fashion imaginable, the prerogative which he had thus implicitly claimed. We refer of course to his definition of the Immaculate Conception. He proclaimed this as a dogma of the Faith on his own sole authority; and he proceeded to declare, that any one who should not firmly believe it made thereby shipwreck concerning the Faith and fell from the Church's unity.* There could not possibly be a more overt and peremptory claim to the power of defining articles of faith for the whole Church. It has been replied indeed, that a vast majority of bishops had already given in their adherence to the prospective definition: but such a reply proceeds on a total misunderstanding of the argument intended. Let it be even supposed, that every bishop in Christendom had pronounced, both for the definableness of the dogma and the expediency of defining it: this would only make the circumstance more remarkable, that so important a fact is not recited in the "*Ineffabilis*" as a basis of the definition. Pius IX., we repeat, rested the authority of his definition, *not* on the prerogative of bishops but on the prerogative of the Apostolic See; and thereby implicitly but most emphatically claimed for himself a power, of defining an article of faith by his own independent authority. And how was his Act received by the Episcopate? With every manifestation of gratitude and delight. To say then that Pontifical infallibility is not a divinely revealed dogma, is to say that the Primate of Christendom on this occasion put forth a claim which involved treachery to the Church's divinely given constitution, and that the whole Catholic Episcopate abetted his usurpation. Protestants of course would be prompt enough with such an allegation; but every true Catholic would regard it with horror unspeakable.

This however is by no means the whole argument derivable from the definition of 1854. Pius IX. did not content himself with a *practical* claim: he *expressed* categorically what he had already implied in act. We refer to the sixth lection, inserted by his command in the Breviary-office for December 8th. Every priest throughout Christendom, with insignificant exceptions, is

* "*Si qui secus à Nobis definitum est præsumperint corde sentire, ii noverint . . . se naufragium circa Fidem passos esse et ab Ecclesiæ unitate defecisse.*"

required to recite on that day, that "Pius IX. Supreme Pontiff solemnly proclaimed" the dogma "*by his supreme and infallible oracle.*" Those who deny that Pontifical infallibility is a revealed verity, must consider that the Episcopate has imposed on all Catholic priests the obligation, of distinctly professing a deadly error which subverts the Church's divinely given constitution.

Nay thirdly the deniers of Pontifical infallibility must admit, that the very prayers earnestly recommended by the Church for the use of the faithful may contain deadly doctrinal poison. "The Messenger of the Sacred Heart" mentions that the Holy Father has enriched with indulgences a prayer in behalf of the Greek schismatics, which contains the following words: "Oh Mary, Immaculate Virgin, we beseech thee to entreat the Divine Spirit in behalf of our erring brethren, that they may return to the Catholic Church *under the infallible authority of its chief Pastor the Roman Pontiff.*" Now no Catholic, however Gallican, doubts that the Pope has power of indulgencing prayers, and so of attaching certain precious spiritual privileges to their use: and even were it otherwise, no bishop has dreamed of protesting against this prayer. If therefore Pontifical infallibility were no revealed verity, it would follow that a prayer, emphatically encouraged by the Church, is polluted by the presence of a deadly error which subverts that Church's divinely given constitution.

But lastly, look at the facts which at this moment are before the eyes of all. The question has been expressly raised, and what is the result? Hardly one bishop can be found in Catholic Christendom, who has ventured to hint a doubt, that Pontifical infallibility is a revealed dogma; the vast majority of bishops press earnestly for its definition; the Holy Father himself, graciously acceding to their petition, has ordered a schema for the purpose to be drawn up and presented. The whole *Ecclesia Docens* then has declared, by the official acts of her various constituent members, that Christ promised and revealed the infallibility of S. Peter's successors.

We repeat therefore our proposition. No one, we maintain, who will advert duly to facts, who is able to understand their bearing, and who will look them steadily in the face, can—without intolerable disrespect to the *Ecclesia Docens*,—allow a moment's doubt to possess his mind, that Christ endowed the Supreme Pontiff with doctrinal infallibility. Nor can we omit our expression of regret, that an incidental word in our last number can have led a most zealous and edifying priest, who has written in the "*Tablet*," to have questioned the unhesitating and unqualified character of our conviction. We hold in fact with the greatest

confidence, that the implicit belief in Papal infallibility has been from the first the Church's one bond of doctrinal unity ; and that if (per impossibile) that belief were to disappear, the whole fabric of dogma would collapse and fall into ruins.*

And here, before going further, we will speak briefly on a cognate question which has been episodically raised. It has been asserted,—not only by Dr. Döllinger, whose opinion on such a subject would be entirely destitute of weight—but by temperate and thoughtful persons, that the Pope could not by his own authority impose on Catholics the obligation of accepting Pontifical infallibility as a dogma of the Faith. We have been greatly surprised at this opinion. We must maintain, as not only undeniable but as manifest on the surface, that supposing Pius IX. were to publish such a definition of faith, no Catholics could decline the dogma, except on some

* Mr. Nary, if we rightly understand his letter, greatly propends to the Ultramontane dogma, but is much impressed by one particular difficulty. That difficulty is founded on the circumstance, that bishops are in the habit of signing conciliar decrees with the words "*definiens subscripsi*"; words which Mr. Nary considers not easily reconcilable with the supposition, that an infallible definition can have already been put forth by a Pope. We will not attempt here to discuss the general question, in what sense the bishops can be considered to decide as *judges* on a matter, which the Pope may have already infallibly determined ; for to do so adequately would require an entire article. We will only consider the particular question raised by Mr. Nary.

And first we will point out negatively, that precisely the same difficulty remains under any phase of Gallicanism. Whatever shade of Gallicanism be adopted, it will still remain true, that bishops from time to time abandon their own independent judgment in deference to the preponderating majority of their brethren. Such a bishop therefore, when he writes "*definiens subscripsi*," by no means implies that his own independent judgment has led him to concur with the definition ; and no such sense therefore legitimately attaches to the words.

Nor, we think, is it at all difficult to understand their signification, even as regards a doctrine which the Pope may have already defined. They express the sense in which, and the purpose for which, each bishop subscribes. A number of persons might imaginably subscribe a dogmatic document, for the mere purpose of expressing their personal concurrence with it. But in the present instance it is otherwise. Each bishop declares in effect : "By subscribing this definition, I declare myself united with my brethren, as a member of the *Ecclesia Docens*, in enforcing this as the Church's Rule of Faith."

There is a fact noticed in our present number, which throws much light on what we have said. A certain condemnation of Honorius was pronounced in the *Acts*, as distinct from the *Definition*, of the Sixth Council ; and the bishops present subscribed their names to the condemnation. But it was only in subscribing the *Definition* that each bishop used the words "*definiens subscripsi*" ; and it was only the *Definition* therefore, which was intended by the bishops as an irreformable Rule of Faith to the Church.

ground which would be quite equally valid against their remaining Catholics at this moment.

We are to suppose the case, that Pius IX. issued a dogmatic Bull or other authentic Act, setting forth certain propositions on the subject, and declaring that all who do not believe them make shipwreck concerning the Faith and fall from Catholic unity. To give our opponents every advantage, we will further suppose that some twenty or thirty bishops refuse to accept the dogma thus defined; and also that they act in concert, and set up a new ecclesiastical society which they jointly govern. On his side of course, the Pontiff gives jurisdiction to certain other bishops who, in subjection to him, govern the dioceses heretofore ruled by the recalcitrants. Plainly the notes of the one Catholic Church would remain on such a supposition precisely the same that they are now, in pointing to that society which is governed by the Pope. The new society could not possibly claim to be the one infallible teacher, authorized and inspired by Christ. The fact would still remain precisely as it is, that there is one and one only existing corporate society, which professes to be lineally descended from, and simply identical with, the Church of the Apostles. Every reason which now justly convinces men that they are bound to become members of the communion united with the Holy See, would be quite equally cogent in the supposed case. But to become members of that communion, requires that they shall believe with divine faith all the dogmata therein enforced as *de fide* Catholicâ; one of which (by hypothesis) would be expressed in certain propositions concerning Pontifical Infallibility. Sufficient proof therefore would be offered to all men, that they are obliged by Christ's law to accept those propositions with divine faith. Q. E. D.

In fact, if the extremely improbable case be imagined that violence were offered to the Vatican Council by some civil government, we should not be at all surprised at this speculative inquiry becoming practical. Pius IX. knows at this moment, that a large majority of the Episcopate considers a definition of Papal infallibility to be not only opportune but necessary. If the kingdoms of this world chose by their violent interference to make its conciliar definition impossible, nothing would be more obvious than that Pius IX. should use the infallible authority which he knows to be vested in him by Christ, for the purpose of saving Christ's Church at so critical a moment.

This little discussion however has been, as we said, episodic; and we are now to consider the second question, on which Catholic controversy has recently turned. It has been urged by some, that Catholic writers take too much on them-

selves in earnestly petitioning for a definition; because that by such petition they in fact dictate to the Council. Now undoubtedly, if a dictatorial tone towards the Council had been assumed by any Catholic,—if any one had implied by his language that he should consider the assembled bishops to fail in their duty did they not publish the definition he desired—for such a Catholic we should have no defence to offer. But nothing of the kind can reasonably be alleged. Catholics have *supplicated* the Council, but they have not affected to *dictate* its course. The whole argument therefore, if it means anything, means this; that by the mere fact of earnestly supplicating the Council to take a particular course, a Catholic by implication represents his own opinion to be more trustworthy than the judgment of the Council. But surely such an argument will not hold for a moment. No one objects (quite the contrary) against men supplicating *God* for what they believe to be a great spiritual blessing; how then can any one reasonably object against men supplicating a *Council* in the same sense? Catholics do not in the latter case, any more than in the former, presume to place their own judgment in competition with that of the Authority to which they appeal: they do but humbly represent their existing earnest desire.

And surely there is every reason in the present case, why those however humble, who desire the definition, *should* loudly express their feeling. The very issue now debated at Rome turns on *opportuneness*; and the question of opportuneness indubitably depends in greater or less degree on the desire of the faithful. No doubt it might very easily happen, that Catholics should dislike the remedy which alone is suitable to their disease; and that the Church therefore should disregard their wishes, in her jealous anxiety for their interests. Still a strong additional argument for opportuneness is presented, in proportion as that course which is otherwise the more salutary should also happen to be the more popular. So far from considering this fact of little account, Pius IX., when deliberating on the definition of 1854, expressly charged the bishops to inform him as to the *desire* of such definition entertained by the faithful. And yet there is much more reason now than there was then, for the pious laity speaking out. Malcontents are not slow in threatening the Council with all sorts of opposition from civil governments; and in holding up “in terrorem” the alleged unpopularity, which “extreme measures” are forsooth to carry in their train. “When bad men conspire, good men must combine”; and when lovers of the world proclaim themselves in force, lovers of the truth are called on to exhibit their numbers and their strength. It is of much importance that the bishops should know on whom

they can thoroughly depend; and we are most grateful therefore to such admirable journals as the "Tablet," the "Unita," the "Bien Public," the "Univers," the "Monde," for their emphatic and repeated testimony to the strong wishes of that portion of the Catholic flock which they respectively represent. "The Messenger of the Sacred Heart" in its February number speaks still more emphatically in the same sense.

But will not the definition of Papal Infallibility sow division among the faithful, and lead them to think that hitherto the Church has been defectively and imperfectly constituted? Strange is it that men who have such opportunities of knowing the actual tendencies of Catholics should be subject to such fears! Surely, if ever the common persuasion of the faithful, the consensus fidelium, be an index to the mind and tradition of the Church,—and Pius IX. in solemnly promulgating the dogma of the Immaculate Conception disdained not to allege this universal consent as one of the great proofs of this doctrine,—we find the same mark stamped no less plainly on the truth we are defending. Universal suffrage has never been used in the Church as a means of settling questions of belief; but should the Council choose to appeal to an immense "plébiscite" of the Christian people and to put to the vote the question of Papal Infallibility, there is scarcely one in a thousand Catholics, faithful to their baptismal engagements, that would not give an affirmative vote. Besides, the hundreds of thousands of handbills containing the vow of believing in the Pope's Infallibility which we are blamed for having circulated,—could they have been so easily and speedily spread abroad throughout Christendom, if this belief were not in unison with the deepest and most universal instincts of "the pious faithful"? Let the gainsayers of Infallibility try to circulate a vow in the opposite sense, and how many Catholics will be found ready to bind themselves to defend, even to the shedding of their blood, the belief in the Pope's fallibility? *

We have not written this for the purpose of defending *ourselves*; because our readers may perhaps have noticed the great reserve with which we have throughout spoken on the subject. See e.g. our last number, pp. 222—224. Indeed our previous reserve

* F. Newman regards certain persons, who have earnestly solicited a definition, as constituting "an insolent and aggressive faction." We have the profoundest personal respect for F. Newman; and we feel moreover keenly, how imperishable is the gratitude which is due to him from all Catholics for his signal services to the Church: but we must protest with our whole spirit against this description, as utterly unfounded and in the highest degree unjust. If such a phrase is to be used at all, it is applicable to the supporters of F. Gratry, and much more to those of Dr. Dollinger and Janus, rather than to those who have defended the truth against such factious and turbulent assailants.

In fairness however to F. Newman, we must entreat our readers to bear in mind that the expression occurs in a strictly confidential letter. Writers of all parties speak much more unguardedly in private communications than in public disquisitions.

may be used as an objection to our present argument; and we may be asked—if open speaking be indeed so great a duty—why we did not ourselves practise it. We shall be able to make our general meaning clearer, if we reply to this supposed objection.

The humblest Catholic, we have urged, may without any appearance of presumption supplicate the Council, as he may supplicate God, for what he accounts a great spiritual blessing. He may most laudably do this, so long as his prayer implies a *condition*; so long as he holds entirely “under correction” his judgment on the reality of that blessing. But if the humblest Catholic expresses what purports to be merely his private judgment, before all things it is necessary that what he expresses should *be* his private judgment. Now, to speak frankly, our own private judgment did not altogether coincide with what we understood to be the general drift of the “Tablet”; and as the very last thing we wished was to promote any disunion among advocates of the good cause, our only refuge was comparative silence. At present however, for reasons which we shall give, we do not see that there is any danger of disunion from our explicitly stating what we mean. We will say therefore, that while we most heartily agree with the writers of the “Tablet” in earnestly supplicating the Council to perform thoroughly its great work of doctrinal “pacification and illumination,”—we have never been able to understand how such a work would be accomplished by a mere assent to their petition. We have never been able to understand, we say, how the necessary work would be sufficiently accomplished by a definition, which should merely speak on the “subject” of infallibility; which should merely declare that, *so far as the Church possesses infallibility*, that infallibility resides in the Pope speaking *ex cathedrâ*. We will proceed to explain our meaning.

The great doctrinal evil—so it seems to us—which now afflicts the Church, is this. In the normal state of things, certain questions are admitted by all Catholics to be closed, and the rest are admitted by all Catholics to be open: or in other words all Catholics are agreed as to what those doctrines are, which Catholics as such are certainly obliged to embrace. This is now very far from being the case. Very many—we ourselves are among the number—are confident that all Catholics are bound (materially at least) under pain of mortal sin to hold various doctrines, which other sincere and piously disposed Catholics overtly reject. Nor can it possibly be said that these doctrines are of subordinate importance: for among them several are included, the contradictories of which have been

enumerated by the *Ecclesia Docens* as among "the principal errors of our most unhappy age." It is sometimes argued indeed, that here is no great practical evil, because "*lex dubia non obligat*." But this is to misapprehend our allegation. Very many Catholics account various doctrinal "*leges*" as not "*dubiæ*" but "*certæ*", which other well-intentioned Catholics deny to be "*leges*" at all. Take e.g. the obligation of avoiding all the errors condemned in the *Syllabus*: is this or is it not a "*lex certa*"? If it is not, then no certain obligation is imposed on Catholics of avoiding "the chief errors of our age." On the other hand if this obligation is a "*lex certa*," then you have the indubitable fact, that various loyally intentioned Catholics think themselves at liberty to set at nought a "*lex certa*." Or (to put the same thing otherwise) various loyally intentioned Catholics think themselves at liberty to embrace and advocate certain tenets, which the *Ecclesia Docens* has declared to be pregnant with danger to faith and morals. Surely this is so serious an evil, that nothing except its actual presence among us could blind us to its grievous results.

But how would this gravest doctrinal calamity of our time be remedied, by a mere definition that the Pope is infallible apart from the Episcopate? On the one hand the *Syllabus* has been as fully sanctioned by the bishops as by the Pope himself: on the other hand several of those who deny its infallibility, admit nevertheless, that whatever infallibility the Church possesses *at all*, is possessed by the Pope. Archbishop Manning testifies—as we quoted in our last number (p. 215)—that among "some" who "hold the infallibility of the Pope" in *definitions of faith*, there is nevertheless "an animus of opposition to the Acts of the Holy See in matters *outside* the Faith."

So far as circumstances enable us to judge, we are in all this but following the mind of the large majority among the assembled Fathers. No signs whatever would lead one to suppose that the very idea has occurred to them, of declaring indeed the Pope's infallibility in definitions of faith, but of being silent as to any further infallibility. Mgr. Dechamps e.g. in his letter to Mgr. Dupanloup, quotes incidentally (p. 18) the inaccurate expression of a previous theologian, who seems (so far as his words go) to limit the Pope's infallibility within the narrow sphere of testifying revealed dogmata. But the Archbishop at once appends a note, reminding his readers of those "divine truths" definable by a Pope, which are not contained in the Deposit explicitly or implicitly, but which are "essentially and inseparably *bound up*" therewith. Then further, two principal

proposals (to mention no others) for the definition of Pontifical infallibility have been made public; and we print them both in our present number. Now it is observable that both these documents adduce, in behalf of the doctrine which their writers desire to be defined, the address signed by so many bishops at Rome in the year 1867. But this address declares in effect, that Pius IX. has frequently spoken *ex cathedrâ* when he has spoken, not for the purpose of *testifying* the Deposit, but for the purpose of *protecting* it. It declares moreover that he has spoken *ex cathedrâ* *often* since their former address to him; nay, that his "*mouth has never been silent*" in condemning *ex cathedrâ* successive errors.* We would entreat our readers to look back at the comments we made on this address in Oct. 1867, pp. 528—532.†

If then we might be allowed in conclusion to address our own humble supplication to the Council, we should heartily indeed join with the "Tablet" in entreating the assembled Fathers to define unmistakably the revealed dogma of Pontifical infallibility. But we should entreat them with no less earnestness, to declare fully and precisely the Church's doctrine on those various questions as to the mutual relation of Church and State, which are raised in France by such Catholics as Falloux and Cochin; to explain what view Catholics are obliged to hold on the inspiration of Scripture; to make quite clear what are the philosophical errors which a Catholic thinker is required to avoid, and within what limits philosophical opinion is free; to define the extent of the Church's infallibility; to throw some general light on the tests of an *ex cathedrâ* Pontifical Act; and lastly to lay down expressly the kind and degree of interior assent, due to those Roman doctrinal utterances which are not strictly *ex cathedrâ*, whether they issue from the Holy Father or from Pontifical Congregations.‡ At the same time, in all sincerity, we add this protestation. If, when the Council shall freely and without external pressure have gone through its

* Yet a distinguished French Catholic has recently said that *ex cathedrâ* judgments are *rare*!

† The alleged schemata, which have found their way into the newspapers, are most express on the extent of the Church's and of the Pope's infallibility. But there can be no certainty that they are genuine; and if they are, they must have been obtained by some gross breach of trust. We have therefore thought it best not to build any argument on them in the text.

‡ While our Number is passing through the press, "the *Civiltà*" for April 2 has arrived before its time. We observe (p. 85) that the writers wish more had been said in the present controversy concerning the "object" of infallibility. The "*Civiltà*" considers that certain Ultramontane authors "speak inaccurately" on the matter and make "excessive restrictions and polemical concessions" on the *extent* of Pontifical infallibility.

prescribed task, we were to find that in every particular it has acted in direct opposition to our humble desires,—the one inference which we should deduce from that circumstance would be, that our notions of what is desirable have been fundamentally mistaken from first to last.

But there is undoubtedly one broad distinction, between the question of Pontifical infallibility and all others. It is this and nothing else, which at the present moment gives a stand-point to bad Catholics, *soi-disant* Catholics, and avowed non-Catholics, in their united assault against the Church. We are very far indeed from meaning to imply, that there are not many excellent Catholics who deprecate the definition; we only say that it is *also* deprecated by those classes which we have mentioned. Our remark then is this. If a definition of Pontifical infallibility were withholden by the Council, acting freely and under no impulse of external pressure;—we should certainly take for granted, that the Church's highest good is best consulted by no definition being given. Yet it still remains obvious and undeniable that, on such a supposition, her ultimate interests would only be promoted, at the cost of giving a temporary enthusiastic triumph to her bitterest and most insulting enemies. For more reasons than one, our own confident expectation is that God will order events otherwise.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS.

THERE are several documents this quarter, which our readers will be glad that we place on somewhat more permanent record than is supplied by a weekly journal. We begin with the translation of a Letter addressed by the Holy Father to F. Ramière, S.J.; which affords another instance of the severity with which he invariably censures the "liberties" of '89, when advocated as *principles*.

To our well beloved son Henry Ramière, priest of the Society of Jesus.

PIUS IX. POPE.

Well-beloved son, health and apostolic benediction.

A great number of peoples in the present day experience the bitterness of having abandoned the Lord, and of having shaken off the sweet yoke of His law. Would to God they might repent and enter into themselves; with this wisdom they would regain every blessing.

Unhappily they will not understand, that it is not in the power of man to

establish society on any other foundation than that laid down by its Divine Author : and they labour with their whole strength to destroy this foundation ; imagining that the progress and perfect happiness of society can only result, from the substitution of their false systems for this divine basis. They therefore give for basis to the social edifice certain supposed liberties, of which they need only call to mind the origin, the perverse nature, and the unhappy results, to understand that all their efforts must inevitably end in ruin, in revolutions, in shameful servitude, and in the most frightful evils.

Accordingly, having perceived from the contents of some of the chapters in the book entitled "Roman Doctrines on Liberalism, considered from the point of view of Christian Dogma and social well-being," that you have carefully treated this matter—We congratulate you on the freedom and courage with which you have elucidated truths, rejected by a great number, but absolutely necessary for the correcting of intellectual errors, and for the preventing of the greatest evils. If it cannot be hoped that your work will open the eyes of the blind and of their blind guides, We augur at least that it will enlighten those whose eyes are dim, and improve the vision even of the clear-sighted.

With this volume you have offered Us another, for which We are equally grateful* : one in which you refute a widely-spread work. You have seized the author's own weapons ; and have made him do battle to himself so successfully, that he has saved his adversaries the trouble of destroying an edifice, which you have forced him to demolish with his own hands.

We therefore give you with tender affection Our apostolic benediction as a sign of Our paternal goodwill, and as a pledge of divine favours.

Given at Rome the 22nd of January, 1870, the twenty-fourth year of Our Pontificate.

We proceed to give in the original the two principal proposals which have been submitted to the Vatican Council, for a definition of Pontifical infallibility :—

I.

A Sacra Œcumenica Synodo Vaticanâ infrascripti Patres humillime instanterque flagitant, ut apertis omnemque dubitandi locum excludentibus verbis sancire velit supremam, ideoque ab errore immunem, esse Romani Pontificis auctoritatem, quum in rebus fidei et morum ea statuit ac præcipit, quæ ab omnibus christifidelibus credenda et tenenda, quæque rejicienda et damnanda sint.

RATIONES OB QUAS HÆC PROPOSITIO OPPORTUNA ET NECESSARIA CENSETUR.

Romani Pontificis, beati Petri Apostoli successoris, in universam Christi Ecclesiam jurisdictionis, adeoque etiam supremi magisterii primatus in sacris Scripturis aperte docetur.

* "Les Contradictions de Mgr. Maret, par le P. Ramière."

Universalis et constans Ecclesiæ traditio tum factis, tum sanctorum Patrum effatis, tum plurimorum Conciliorum etiam œcumenicorum et agendi et loquendi ratione, docet, Romani Pontificis judicia de fidei morumque doctrinâ irreformabilia esse.

Consentientibus Græcis et Latinis, in Concilio II. Lugdunensi admissa professio fidei est, in quâ declaratur: "Subortas de fide controversias debere Romani Pontificis judicio definiri." In Florentinâ itidem œcumenicâ Synodo definitum est: "Romanum Pontificem esse verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem et doctorem; et ipsi, in beato Petro, pascendi regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse." Ipsa quoque sana ratio docet, neminem stare posse in fidei communione cum Ecclesiâ Catholicâ, qui ejus capiti non consentiat, quum ne cogitatione quidem Ecclesiam a suo capite separare liceat.

Attamen fuerunt atque adhucdum sunt, qui, Catholicorum nomine gloriantes, eoque etiam ad infirmorum in fide perniciem abutentes, docere præsumant, eam sufficere submissionem erga Romani Pontificis auctoritatem, quâ ejus de fide moribusque decreta obsequioso, ut aiunt, silentio, sine interno mentis assensu, vel provisorie tantum usquedum de Ecclesiæ assensu vel dissensu constiterit, suscipiantur.

Hæc porro perversâ doctrinâ Romani Pontificis auctoritatem subverti, fidei unitatem dissipari, erroribus campum amplissimum aperiri tempusque late serpendi tribui, nemo non videt.

Quare Episcopi, catholicæ veritatis custodes et vindices, his potissimum temporibus connisi sunt, ut supremam Apostolicæ Sedis docendi auctoritatem synodalibus præsertim decretis et communibus testimoniis tuerentur.

Quo evidentius vero catholica veritas prædicabatur, eo vehementius, tam libellis quam ephemeridibus, nuperrime impugnata est, ut catholicus populus contra sanam doctrinam commoveretur, ipsaque Vaticana Synodus ab eâ definiendâ abstereretur.

Quare, si antea de opportunitate istius doctrinæ in hoc Œcumenico Concilio pronuntiandæ a pluribus dubitari adhuc potuit, nunc eam definire necessarium prorsus videtur. Catholica enim doctrina iisdem plane argumentis denuo impetitur, quibus olim homines, proprio judicio condemnati, adversus eam utebantur; quibus, si urgeantur, ipse Romani Pontificis primatus Ecclesiæque infallibilitas pessumdatur; et quibus sæpe deterrima convicia contra Apostolicam Sedem admiscuntur. Immo acerbissimi catholicæ doctrinæ impugnatores, licet Catholicos se dicant, affirmare non erubescunt, Florentinam Synodum, supremam Romani Pontificis auctoritatem luculentissime profitentem, œcumenicam non fuisse.

Si igitur Concilium Vaticanum, adeo provocatum, taceret et catholicæ doctrinæ testimonium dare negligeret, tunc catholicus populus de verâ doctrinâ reapse dubitare inciperet; neoterici autem gloriantes assererent, Concilium ob argumenta ab ipsis allata siluisse. Quinimmo silentio hoc semper abuterentur, ut Apostolicæ Sedis judiciis et decretis circa fidem et mores palam obedientiam negarent, contententes quod Romanus Pontifex in ejusmodi judiciis ferendis falli potuerit.

Publicum itaque rei christianæ bonum postulare videtur, ut Sacrosanctum Concilium Vaticanum, Florentinum decretum de Romano Pontifice denuo profitens et uberius explicans, apertis omnemque dubitandi locum præcludentibus verbis sancire velit, supremam ideoque ab errore immunem esse ejusdem Romani Pontificis auctoritatem, quoniam in rebus fidei et morum ea statuit ac præcipit, quæ ab omnibus christifidelibus credenda et tenenda, quæve rejicienda et damnanda sint.

Non desunt quidem qui existiment, a catholicâ hâc veritate sanciendâ abstinendum esse, ne schismatici atque hæretici longius ab Ecclesia aceantur. Sed in primis catholicus populus jus habet, ut ab Œcumenicâ Synodo doceatur, quid in re tam gravi et tam improbe nuper impugnatâ credendum sit, ne simplices et incautos multorum animos perniciosus error tandem corrumpat. Idcirco etiam Lugdunenses et Tridentini Patres rectam doctrinam stabiliendam esse censuerunt, etsi schismatici et hæretici offenderentur. Qui si sincerâ mente veritatem quærant, non absterrebuntur sed allicientur, dum ipsis ostenditur, quo potissimum fundamento Catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitas et firmitas nitatur. Si qui autem, verâ doctrinâ ab Œcumenico Concilio definitâ, ab Ecclesia deficerent, hi numero pauci et jamdudum in fide naufragi sunt, prætextum solummodo quærentes, quo externâ etiam actione ab Ecclesiâ se eximant, quam interno sensu jam deseruisse palam ostendunt. Hi sunt, qui catholicum populum continuo turbare non abhorruerunt, et a quorum insidiis Vaticana Synodus fideles Ecclesiæ filios tueri debet. Catholicus enimvero populus, semper edoctus et assuetus Apostolicis Romani Pontificis decretis plenissimum mentis et oris obsequium exhibere, Vaticani Concilii sententiam de ejusdem supremâ et ab errore immuni auctoritate læto fidelique animo excipiet.

APPENDIX

Novissimarum Provincialium Synodorum et communis Episcoporum Sententia de supremâ et ab errore immuni Romani Pontificis in rebus fidei et morum Auctoritate.

1. Concilium provinciale *Coloniense*, anno 1860 celebratum, cui, præter eminentissimum Cardinalem et Archiepiscopum Coloniensem, Joannem de Geissel, quinque subscripserunt Episcopi, diserte docet: "Ipse (Romanus Pontifex) est omnium Christianorum pater et doctor, *cujus in fidei questionibus per se irreformabile est judicium.*"

2. Episcopi in Concilio provinciali *Ultrajectensi* anno 1865 congregati apertissime edicunt: "(Romani Pontificis) judicium in iis, quæ ad fidem moresque spectant, *infallibile* esse, indubitanter retinemus."

3. Concilium provinciale *Pragense*, anno 1860 celebratum, cui cum Eminentissimo Cardinali et Archiepiscopo Friderico De Schwarzenberg, quatuor alii Episcopi definientes subscripserunt, titulo "*De Primatu Romani Pontificis*," hæc statuit: "Rejicimus porro errorem illorum, qui alicubi Ecclesiam Catholicam existere posse autumant absque unitatis vinculo cum Ecclesiâ Romanâ, "in quâ semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio." (S. Irenæus adv. Hæres. 1. 3, c. 3, n. 2.) Sciens neminem, qui extra unionem capitis est, censeri

posse inter membra corporis Ecclesiæ, quam Dominus super Petrum fundavit et in ejus auctoritate solidavit. Confiteantur potius nobiscum et cum orthodoxis per orbem terrarum fidelium turmis sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Principatum et Pontificis Romani Primatum; summâ, quâ decet, pietate nobiscum venerentur colantque Sanctissimum Dominum nostrum Pium, divinâ providentiâ Papam IX., ceu legitimum Principis Apostolorum successorem, Jesu Christi in terris Vicarium, supremum fidei doctorem et navis Christi gubernatorem, cui *fidelissima obedientia animique assensus ab omnibus, qui ad ovile Christi pertinere volunt, præstetur*. Declaramus et docemus, hanc Romani Pontificis auctoritatem à Christo Domino descendere, a nullâ proin hominum potestate vel concessione pendere, atque omni tempore et in atrocissimis Romanæ Ecclesiæ afflictionibus perdurare illibatam, prout etiam in carceribus et martyriis beati Petri perduravit."

4. Concilium provinciale *Colocense*, anno 1860 celebratum, hæc statuit: "Quemadmodum Petrus erat . . . doctrinæ fidei magister irrefragabilis, pro quo ipse Dominus rogavit ut non deficeret fides ejus . . .; pari modo legitimi ejus in cathedræ Romanæ culmine successores . . . depositum fidei summo et irrefragabili oraculo custodiunt. . . . Unde propositiones cleri gallicani anno 1682 editas, quas jam piæ memoriæ Georgius Archiepiscopus Strigoniensis una cum ceteris Hungariæ Præsulibus eodem adhuc anno publice proscripsit, itidem rejicimus, proscribimus, atque cunctis Provinciæ hujus fidelibus interdiciamus, ne eas legere vel tenere, multo minus docere, audent."

5. Concilium plenarium *Baltimoreense*, anno 1866 coactum, in decretis, quibus 44 Archiepiscopi et Episcopi subscripserunt, inter alia hæc docet: "Viva et infallibilis auctoritas in eâ tantum viget Ecclesiâ, quæ a Christo Domino supra Petrum, totius Ecclesiæ caput principem et pastorem, cujus fidem nunquam defecturam promisit, ædificata, suos legitimos semper habet Pontifices, sine intermissione ab ipso Petro ducentes originem, in ejus cathedra collocatos, et ejusdem etiam doctrinæ, dignitatis, honoris et potestatis hæredes et vindices. Et quoniam ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia, ac Petrus per Romanum Pontificem loquitur et semper in suis successoribus vivit et judicium exercet ac præstat quærentibus fidei veritatem; *idcirco divina eloquia eo plane sensu sunt accipienda, quem tenuit ac tenet hæc Romana beatissimi Petri cathedra*, quæ omnium Ecclesiarum mater et magistra, fidem a Christo Domino traditam integram inviolatamque semper servavit, eamque fideles edocuit, omnibus ostendens salutis semitam et incorruptæ veritatis doctrinam."

6. Concilium primum provinciale Westmonasteriense, anno 1852 habitum, profitetur: "Cum Dominus noster adhortetur dicens: Attendite ad petram unde excisi estis; attendite ad Abraham, patrem vestrum: æquum est, nos, qui immediate ab Apostolicâ Sede fidem, sacerdotium, veramque religionem accepimus, eidem plus ceteris amoris et observantiæ vinculis adstringi. *Fundamentum igitur veræ et orthodoxæ fidei ponimus, quod Dominus noster Jesus Christus ponere voluit inconcussum, scilicet Petri cathedram, totius orbis magistram et matrem, S. Romanam Ecclesiam. Quid quid ab ipsâ semel definitum est, eo ipso ratum et certum tenemus*; ipsius

traditiones, ritus, pios usus et omnes apostolicas constitutiones, disciplinam respicientes, toto corde amplectimur et veneramur. Summo denique Pontifici obedientiam et reverentiam, ut Christi Vicario, ex animo profiteamur, eique arctissime in catholicâ communione adhæremus."

7. Quingenti prope Episcopi, ex toto terrarum orbe ad agenda *solemnia sæcularia* Martyrii Sanctorum Petri et Pauli anno 1867 in hâc almâ Urbe congregati, minime dubitarunt, Supremum Pontificem Pium IX., hisce alloqui verbis: "Petrum per os Pii locutum fuisse credentes, quæ ad custodiendum depositum a Te dicta, confirmata, prolata sunt, nos quoque dicimus, confirmamus, annunciamus, unoque ore atque animo rejicimus omnia, quæ divinæ fidei, salutis animarum, ipsi societatis humanæ bono adversa, Tu ipse reprobanda ac rejicienda judicasti. Firmum enim menti nostræ est alteque defixum, quod Patres Florentini in decreto unionis definierunt: Romanum Pontificem Christi Vicarium totius Ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum patrem et doctorem exsistere."

II.

SCHEMA

PRO INFALLIBILITATE ROMANI PONTIFICIS ex principiis jam ab Ecclesiâ universâ receptis logice clareque definienda.

In ipso capite de Romano Pontifice, damnatis primo loco erroribus contra ejus Primatum, hæc et similia, si placeat, adjungi poterunt:

1. Omnino reprobamus eorum temeritatem, qui a summi Pontificis supremis judiciis ad Concilium Œcumenicum appellare audent.

2. Deinde prorsus damnamus perversas eorum cavillationes qui dicere audent, externum quidem obsequium, non autem internum mentis cordisque assensum Romani Pontificis judiciis esse præstandum.

3. Insuper omnino improbamus eorum loquendi et docendi rationem, qui temerariâ quâdam et præposterâ divisione inter cœtum Episcoporum et summum Pontificem excogitatâ, disputant uter eorum videatur esse major, et sic caput a corpore, Petrum ab Ecclesiâ, distrahere et sejungere conantur: quasi fratrum cœtus, quos Petrus etiam in successoribus suis confirmat ut jubetur, posset unquam ab Illo desciscere, cujus fides ex Christi promissione nunquam deficiet; aut iis qui a Petro docendi sunt et confirmandi, Ipsum contra docere et confirmare liceret.

4. Neque minus reprobendam judicamus illorum sententiam et agendi rationem, qui, ut errores a Romano Pontifice damnatos in vulgus diffundere liberius valeant, dictitare non verentur, verum sensum librorum, ex quibus damnatæ hujusmodi propositiones excerptæ sunt, a Pontifice haud rite intellectum fuisse.

Quæ quidem omnia illustrantur confirmanturque ab eis quæ sequuntur.

1. Atque ita quidem sentire se luculenter testatus est totius fere catholici orbis Episcopatus nuperrime Romæ congregatus, dum summum Pontificem feliciter regnantem præclaris hisce verbis allocutus est: "Non enim unquam obticuit os tuum. Tu æternas veritates annunciare, Tu sæculi

errores naturalem supernaturalemque rerum ordinem atque ipsa ecclesiasticæ civilisque potestatis fundamenta subvertere minitantes Apostolici eloquii gladio configere, Tu caliginem novarum doctrinarum pravitate mentibus offusam dispellere, Tu quæ necessaria ac salutaria sunt tum singulis hominibus, tum Christianæ familiæ, tum civili societati, intrepide, effari, suadere, commendare supremi Tui ministerii es arbitratus: ut tandem cuncti assequantur quid hominem Catholicum tenere, servare, ac profiteri oporteat. Pro quâ eximiâ curâ maximas Sanctitati Tux gratias agimus, habituri sumus sempiternas; Petrumque per os Pii locutum credentes, quæ ad custodiendum depositum a Te dicta, confirmata, prolata sunt, nos quoque dicimus, confirmamus, annunciamus; unoque ore atque animo rejicimus omnia, quæ divinæ fidei, saluti animarum, ipsi societatis humanæ bono adversa, Tu ipse reprobanda ac rejicienda judicasti.”*

2. Nam “viva et infallibilis auctoritas in eâ tantum viget Ecclesiâ, quæ a Christo Domino super Petrum, totius Ecclesiæ caput principem et pastorem, cujus fidem nunquam defuturam promisit, ædificata, suos legitimos semper habet Pontifices, sine intermissione ab ipso Petro ducentes originem, in ejus cathedrâ collocatos, et ejusdem etiam doctrinæ, dignitatis, honoris, ac potestatis hæredes et vindices. Et quoniam ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesiâ, ac Petrus per Romanum Pontificem loquitur,† et semper in suis successoribus vivit et judicium exercet,§ ac præstat quærentibus fidei veritatem;|| idcirco divina eloquia eo plane sensu sunt accipienda, quem tenuit ac tenet hæc Romana beatissimi Petri cathedra, quæ omnium Ecclesiarum mater et magistra,¶ fidem, a Christo Domino traditam, integram inviolatamque semper servavit, eamque fideles edocuit, omnibus ostendens salutis semitam et incorruptæ veritatis doctrinam.”**

Rationes ob quas schema supra propositum magis expedire creditur.

I. Primo sperari tuto potest, fore ut hujusmodi schema Patribus quas universis magis arrideat, et eorum unanimi fere suffragio confirmetur. Continet enim certa et inconcussa doctrinæ catholicæ principia, jam in universâ Ecclesia recepta, quæque agnoscunt et profitentur omnes, paucis exceptis, quorum numerus adeo exiguus est ut ejus nulla ratio habenda videatur.

II. Plena hæc Patrum omnium (vel saltem fere omnium) consensio non solum expedit, sed omnino postulari videtur, quando agitur de capite doctrinæ definiendo: præsertim in re tanti momenti; quæ sane nemine (si id fieri possit) dissentiente definiri deberet.

III. Hoc autem tempore ejusmodi unanimitas summopere necessaria videtur, ob voces in vulgus sparsas et ubique creditas, quibus magna inter

* Responsio Episcoporum ad SS. D. N. Allocationem, in solemn. sæc. Martyrii SS. Petri et Pauli, die 1 julii 1867; cui Responsioni subscripserunt quingenti fere Episcopi.

† S. Ambrosius in Ps. XL.

‡ Concil. Chalced., act. II.

§ Synodus Ephes., act. III.

|| S. Petrus Chrysol., in Epist. ad Eutyech.

¶ Concil. Trid. sess. VII. de Bapt.

** SS. D. N. Epistola Encycl., 9 novemb. 1846, a Concilio Baltimorensi Plenario II. relata, in Decreto de Hierarchia, cap. II. p. 42, 43.

Patres hac de re discordia esse perhibetur. Unanimis Patrum definitio hostibus nostris sic temere gloriantibus os penitus obstrueret, et maximam Ecclesiæ Dei ædificationem pareret. Profecto satis hostium externorum habemus, quin in ipsis Ecclesiæ castris nova dissidia excitemus, vel ullo modo fovere videamur.

IV. Propositus implicite definiendi modus, quamvis sit indirectus, videtur tamen tum vi tum simplicitate præstare. Clarius enim est, ac plura forsitan continet, quam definitio formalis et explicita. Hæc enim plures cavillandi locos theologis suppeditabit. Disceptabitur perpetuo inter eos, quando et quibus rerum adjunctis Romanus Pontifex omnes Christifideles allocutus fuisse, et infallibile iudicium protulisse, credendus sit. Indecisæ adhuc manebunt omnes illæ quæstiones, etiam inter piissimos Pontificiæ infallibilitatis propugnatores hactenus agitatæ, de personâ Pontificis docentis publicâ et privatâ, de verâ locutionis *ex Cathedrâ* significatione, de rebus quæ ad fidem moresque *vere* spectant. Immo violentius forsitan erumpent huiusmodi quæstiones, et longe majore animi contentione pertractabuntur.

V. In proposito autem definiendi Schemate nulla fit ullaque requiritur distinctio expressa; nam inerrantiam Romani Pontificis cum Ecclesiæ ipsius infallibilitate intime conjungit, eamque veluti logicam ipsius Primatus sequelam et veluti corollarium exhibet, adeo ut tam late pateat iisdemque limitibus contineatur ac ipsa Ecclesiæ infallibilitas ipseque divinitus constitutus Primatus; quæ quidem fidei principia jam ab Ecclesiæ ipsius primordiis satis fixa et determinata sunt. Huiusmodi igitur definiendi ratione, ansa nulla præbetur sive theologis, sive fidelibus, dubitandi aut cavillandi circa jussa et decreta S. Pontificis, cujus sapientissimo consilio, dum pascit tam agnos quam oves, sicut decet filios erga Patrem, omnia reverenter et amanter relinquuntur dirimenda.

VI. Demum hæc definiendi ratio, dum fixa quædam et immota principia ubique recepta asserit, simul hoc commodi habet, ut non solum Christianis omnibus infallibilem in fidei morumque rebus, nullo dubitandi vel cavillandi loco relicto, credendi et agendi normam proponat, sed etiam futurorum præcipue temporum bono prospiciat. Formalis vero definitio, cum vi suâ ad omnia etiam retroacta sæcula protenderetur, facile universum historiæ ecclesiasticæ campum totumque Bullarium Theologorum cavillationibus et hæreticorum impiorumque adversus Romanos Pontifices criminationibus, jam ferè sopitis, aperiret.

We next print a translation, borrowed with one or two verbal changes from the "Union Review," of an answer published by Dr. Döllinger to the former of the preceding papers. We do so partly, that our readers may better understand the reply of the "Civiltà," which we afterwards subjoin. But we wish them also to observe the incredible weakness of Dr. Döllinger's arguments. Either his abilities have been preposterously overrated, or (which we ourselves believe to be the case) the imbecility of his present exhibition arises from moral causes connected with the present crisis, which we will not particularize.

You have published the extraordinary address which, from the womb of the Vatican Council, prays the Pope to be pleased to take the requisite steps for allowing the present assembly to raise his personal infallibility to an article of faith. One hundred and eighty million human beings—this the Bishops who have signed this address demand—shall in future, through the threat of exclusion from the Church, of the withdrawal of the sacraments, and of everlasting damnation, be compelled to believe and to admit that which the Church up to the present moment has not believed, has not taught. Has not believed;—for even those who hitherto have held this Papal Infallibility as true, nevertheless have not been able to *believe* it, this word being taken in a Christian sense. Between believing (*fide divinâ*) and the intellectual reception of an opinion held for likely, there is an immeasurable difference. The Catholic can and dares believe only what has been revealed to him as divine;—what belongs to the substance of sacred doctrine;—what is announced and declared to him by the Church to be a truth raised above every doubt;—only that whose reception is bound up with the belonging to the Church;—only that the opposite of which the Church simply does not endure but rejects as open heresy. In truth, then, no human being, from the foundation of the Church up to the present day, has believed in the infallibility of the Pope—that is to say, so believed as he believes in God, in Christ, in the Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and so on; but many have merely supposed—have held it for probable, or at most for humanly certain (*fide humanâ*), that this prerogative belongs to the Pope. Therefore the change in the faith and in the teaching of the Church, which the Bishops' address would desire to be carried out, would be an event standing alone in the history of the Church: in eighteen centuries nothing similar has happened. It is a Church revolution which they require, so much the more complete since it here concerns the foundation, on which the religious faith of each man hereafter shall repose; since in the place of the Church, whole in time and universal in space, one single man, the Pope, shall be set. Hitherto the Catholic has said, "I believe this or that doctrine on the witness of the whole Church of all times, because she has the assurance that she shall exist for ever—shall always remain in possession of the truth." Hereafter, however, must the Catholic say, "I believe this or that doctrine because the Pope, declared infallible, orders me to teach it and believe it. But that he is infallible, that I believe because he maintains it of himself. For in the year 1870, some 400 or 600 Bishops have, it is true, agreed at Rome that the Pope is infallible; but all Bishops and every Council without the Pope are open to the possibility of error; infallibility is the exclusive right and possession of the Pope; the Bishops, many or few, can neither strengthen nor weaken his witness; that decree has therefore only so much force and authority as the Pope has given it, by appropriating it to himself." And so at last everything resolves itself into the self-witness of the Pope, which verily is very simple. But here be it just recalled that 1840 years ago an infinitely higher than the Pope once said, "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true" (John v. 31).

The address specially gives rise to the following reflections:—

First, it confines the infallibility of the Pope to those claims and decrees which he addresses to the whole body of believers, which, therefore, he publishes for the information of the whole Catholic Church.

From this then would follow, that when a Pope addressed himself only to single persons, societies, or particular Churches, he was always open to error. Now, the Popes during twelve or thirteen centuries never fulfilled the condition with which the freedom from error of their decisions or teachings would be bound up: all announcements of the Popes on questions of doctrine before the end of the thirteenth century are addressed only to individuals or to the bishops of a country, or so on. To the whole Eastern Church, in the centuries of union, a decree speaking universally was never directed; only—and at long intervals—to single Patriarchs or to Emperors have the Popes addressed dogmatic epistles.

It is therefore clear that the Popes themselves, at least for a thousand years, had no notion of the condition upon which the certainty and infallibility of their decisions should depend; as this assertion also was devised very late, and was unknown to the Church before 1562. In that year the theologian John Hessels propounded it for the first time; from whom Bellarmine borrowed it and propped it up by passages from the false Isidorian decrees and by the forged witness of S. Cyril. With one single previous word, by the mere heading, the Popes would have been able to give to their dogmatic announcements the highest prerogative of infallibility. They did not do it; they placed persons and parishes in the danger of falling into error through the acceptance of their decisions—decisions given without the security of divine certainty.

Secondly, it is untrue that “in accordance with the universal and constant tradition of the Church the dogmatic decisions of the Popes are unchangeable.” The opposite is evident to every eye. The Church has always first tried the dogmatic writings of the Popes: and either, in consequence of this trial, agreed with them, as the Council of Chalcedon with the letter of Leo; or cast them out as erroneous, as the Fifth Council (553) did with the *Constitutum* of Vigilius, the Sixth Council (681) with the Letter of Honorius.

Thirdly, it is not correct that in the Second Council of Lyons (1274), through the acquiescence of the Greeks as well as of the Latins, a declaration of faith was accepted, in which it is declared that “conflicts upon faith must be decided through the sentence of the Pope.” Neither the Greeks nor the Latins—that is to say, the Western Bishops assembled at Lyons—appropriated this declaration of faith; but the dead Pope Clement IV. had sent it to the Emperor Michael Palæologus, as the condition of his admission to communion. Michael, in uncertain possession of the capital, which had been taken shortly before and which was now seriously threatened by the Emperor Baldwin and King Charles of Sicily, was in urgent need of the Pope, who alone could compel his chief enemy to remain quiet, and therefore gave in to the condition of ecclesiastical submission which the Pope had proposed to him, although under the steady opposition of the Greek Bishops and of the nation. He therefore introduced the

formula proposed to him into the document, which was read before the Council and was confirmed by his ambassador. He himself at home in Constantinople declared the three concessions which he had made to the Pope illusory. The assembled bishops, however, did not find themselves in a position to give an opinion on this formula.

Fourthly, the decree of the Florentine Synod is here produced mutilated; just the main sentence (whose promulgation in consequence of long negotiations between the Greeks and the Italians was brought about, and upon which the greatest stress was laid, because what precedes should only be understood by means of the limitation therein contained) is left out—the sentence, namely, “*juxta eum modum, quo et in gestis et in sacris canonibus œcumenicorum conciliorum continetur.*” The Pope and the Cardinals demanded resolutely, that for the sake of a more exact definition of how the Primacy of the Pope should be understood there should be added, “*juxta dicta Sanctorum.*” This the Greeks rejected with equal resolution. They knew well that among these “*testimonies of the Saints*” were to be found a considerable number of very wide-reaching or falsified paragraphs. Although the Latin Archbishop Andreas, one of the speakers, had appealed already in the seventh sitting to the above-named testimony of S. Cyril, which, since Thomas Aquinas and Pope Urban IV. first had been deceived by it, had produced in the West a powerful and enduring effect, nevertheless now it was rejected by the Greeks. The Emperor remarked further, because one of the Fathers, in a letter to the Pope, had expressed himself in a complimentary style, that was no ground for deducing therefrom rights and privileges forthwith. The Latins gave way at last; the “*dicta Sanctorum*” disappeared from the sketch; and in its place the transactions of the Œcumenical Councils and the Sacred Canons were *set as measure and bound* of the Papal Primacy. Therewith every idea of Papal infallibility was excluded: as in the old Councils and in the pre-Isidorian canons common to both Churches not only nothing is found which points to such a claim, but the whole ancient legislation of the Church, as well as the procedure and the history of the seven Œcumenical Councils (these were meant), quite evidently supposed a condition in which the highest authority in doctrine belongs only to the Church collective, but not to a single one of the five Patriarchs (such was the Pope in the eyes of the Greeks). Further than this, the Archbishop Bessarion, in the name of the entire body of Greeks, just before declares that the Pope is inferior to the Council (therefore also not infallible). (Sess. IX. Concil. Labbei, xiii. 150.) It is therefore a mutilation which is equal to a falsification, when from the decree of the Florentine Synod exactly the main sentence is cut out, upon which sentence they for whom the decree was made laid the highest stress. The sentence was in the eyes of the Greeks so essential, that they declared they would depart without concluding the business if it were not introduced. Also they insisted upon this, and carried it through, that all rights and privileges of the remaining prelates should be maintained in the decree; moreover the Pope himself had previously declared that the right of taking part independently in the settling

of the common Church doctrine, the not being under the necessity of merely submitting to the claims of an infallible Pope, belonged to the Patriarchs.

There may be still another ground for the mutilation of the Florentine decree committed by the conceiver of the address. Does he give the Latin text in its original form answering to the Greek, as Flavius Blondus, secretary of the Pope Eugenius IV., and the other theologians have done; "*quemadmodum et in actis conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur*"? Or does he use the falsification (first introduced by Abraham Bartholomæus) where, in place of *et, etiam* is introduced? Through this *etiam* the sense of the decree is entirely changed, and the object of the conclusion annulled. It has, however, although it is an obvious falsification, found its way into the Council—compilations and dogmatic compendiums; and it is high time to get rid of this stumbling-stone for the Orientals and to replace the genuine text—namely, that answering to the Greek text. Then, however, would the decree be no more fit for use for the objects of the Infallibilists, as the Archbishop of Paris, D. Marca, 200 years ago has shown. (*Concord. Sacerd. et Imperii.*) He rightly remarks—"Verba Græca in sincero sensu accepta modum exercitio potestatis Pontificiæ imponunt ei similem quem Ecclesia Gallicana tuetur. At e contextûs Latini depravatâ lectione eruitur, plenam esse potestatem Papæ idque probari actis conciliorum et canonibus."

The address declares itself with special indignation ("*acerbissimi catholicæ doctrinæ impugnatores . . . blaterare non erubescunt*") against those who do not hold the Florentine Council for œcumenical. Let the facts speak. The Synod was, as is well known, summoned to overthrow the Council at Basle, when this had begun to decree reforms annoying to the Roman Curia. On the 9th of April, 1438, it was opened at Ferrara; and they had to wait six months before anything at all took place, so small was the number of bishops who came. Out of the whole of Northern Europe, then still fully Catholic, from Germany, from Scandinavia, Poland, Bohemia, France, Castille, Portugal, &c., no one came; one can say that nine-tenths of the then Catholic world took absolutely no share in the Synod, because, as opposed to the Basle assembly, it was held to be illegitimate, and each one knew that for the most urgent concern—the reform of the Church—nothing would be done there. Then at last with much toil Eugenius brought together a troop of Italian bishops, about fifty; whereto then came further some bishops sent by the Duke of Burgundy, some Provençals, and one or two Spaniards—in all there were sixty-two Bishops who signed. The Greek prelates, with their Emperor, had been drawn thither by the promise of money, ships, and soldiers, being in the extremest danger of ruin; the Pope, moreover, had promised to bear the cost of their maintenance in Ferrara and in Florence, as also of their return journey. When they showed themselves unsubmitive, he withdrew the subsidies, so that they fell into the bitterest want; and at last, forced by the Emperor and pressed by hunger, they signed things, nearly all of which afterwards they recalled. The judgment of a Greek contemporary, Amprutius, which the Roman scholar Leo Allatius (*de Perp. Consens.*, 3,

1, 4) produces, was then the prevalent judgment among the Greeks: "Will, indeed," says he, "any one in earnest declare this Synod to be Œcumenical, which bought articles of faith with money, which could only carry through its edicts simoniacally, only by the prospect of financial and military aid?" In France, before the Revolution, the Florentine Synod was discarded as unguenuine: so Cardinal Guise declared in the Tridentine Council, without experiencing any contradiction. The Portuguese theologian Payva de Andrada says thereon, "*Florentinam (Synodum) sola Gallia pro œcumenicâ nunquam habuit, quippe quam neque adire dum agigaretur, neque admittere jam perfectam atque absolutam voluerit.*" (*Defens. Fid. Trident.*, p. 431, ed. Colon., 158.)

The remaining text of the address busies itself with the proving that the promulgation of the new article of faith just now is suitable to our times; yes, and urgently needful, because some persons who give themselves out as Catholics have recently questioned this idea of Papal infallibility. What the address partly says here, partly as known (in Rome) takes for granted, is mainly the following. For its own sake simply, it holds, it would not be quite absolutely needful to increase the number of the articles of faith by a new dogma, but the state of things has become so fashioned that this now is unavoidable. For many years the Jesuits, supported by like-thinking partisans, have entered on an agitation in favour of the dogma that is to be, in Italy, France, Germany, and England. A special religious society has been founded by the Jesuits and openly announced, with the object of praying and working for the attainment of the new dogma; their chief organ the *Civiltà* has named it beforehand as the main business of the Council to give to the longing world the present of the missing article of faith. Their publications have stated far and wide, and in untiring repetition, the same theme.

During this agitation it should have been the duty of all who think otherwise to remain in reverential silence, to let the Jesuits and their hangers-on quietly do what they like, to subject the arguments promulgated by them in numerous pamphlets to no analysis. Unfortunately this has not happened; some persons have had the unheard-of impertinence to break the sacred silence, and to announce a different opinion. This scandal can only be removed by an increase in the articles of faith, and a change in the Catechisms and in all the religious books.

DR. J. J. DÖLLINGER.

The "*Civiltà*" replies as follows. We have to thank the "Vatican" for its admirable translation, which we here reproduce.

The petition presented by the Bishops to the Vatican Council, for the definition of the inerrability of the Pope when speaking *ex cathedrâ*, has given great displeasure to the Gallicans of the present day. It was therefore most natural that it should call forth all the strength of Dr. Döllinger, who has made himself the centre and prime mover of that party in Germany. Nor can we wonder that, laying aside the veil of the anonymous

- and leaving the hidden ways of his previous tactics, he has now come forward in his own name with a virulent article in the anti-Catholic *Augsburg Gazette*—an article on which it is difficult to say which is worst, the substance or the manner. But this need not be a subject of grief, since open enmity is less hurtful than hidden snares.

I.

Dr. Döllinger's article contains two parts: in the first he attacks the possibility of defining Papal inerrancy; in the second, he attacks the arguments which the bishops have employed in their petition.

As to the first, his arguments may be summed up in these three: First, by such a definition the Church would oblige Catholics to believe that which up to the present time she has herself neither believed nor taught; second, by such a definition a radical revolution respecting the foundation of the faith would be effected in the Church; third, by such a definition the Pope would bear testimony to himself, which would be an absurdity. Let us briefly examine all three.

II.

And, to begin with the first argument, how does Dr. Döllinger show that up to the present time the Church has neither believed nor taught Papal infallibility? "She has not believed it," he says, "because even those who have hitherto held the infallibility of the Pope to be true have not been able to *believe* it, this word being taken in a Christian sense." The argument is very clear. A non posse ad non esse datur illatio. "If the faithful were not able to believe the Pope's infallibility, they did not believe it, and the Church did not teach it them." It remains then to be proved why the faithful were not able to believe it. Nothing is easier. "Between believing (*fide divinā*)," adds Döllinger, "and accepting intellectually any opinion held to be probable, there is an immense difference. The Catholic is able, and is bound, to believe only that which is prescribed to him by the Church as divinely-revealed truth, belonging to the essence of saving doctrine, and superior to every doubt; only that, upon the confession of which Church-membership depends, that of which the contrary is absolutely not tolerated by the Church and is rejected by her as open heresy. In truth, therefore, no man, from the beginning of the Church up to the present day, has believed in the infallibility of the Pope, that is, believed it in the way in which he believes in God, in Christ, in the Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but many have only suspected, have believed it to be probable, and, at the most, to be humanly certain (*fide humanā*) that this prerogative belongs to the Pope."

III.

Here Dr. Döllinger is mistaken, both in the principle he sets up and in the application he makes of it. In the first place, he is mistaken as to the principle, inasmuch as he confounds *faith* simply *divine* with *divine Catholic faith*; and hence, from not finding the latter, in its strict and full sense, in the belief in Papal infallibility, he infers that the former also is not to be found therein. The conclusion is larger than the premiss. Every

student of theology knows, that when a truth is not only revealed by God, but is also defined as such by the Church and its contrary rejected as heresy, it is said to be a truth of *divine Catholic faith*, because no one who denies it can belong to the Church. But the truths contained in the Deposit of revelation are not all defined in this way by the Church. There are many of them on which the Church has not yet pronounced a definitive judgment, and which are nevertheless revealed by God. When a Catholic then, by his study of Scripture or of Tradition, recognizes these truths as such, in what way does he give assent to them? Is it with *human faith*? Certainly not; because he does not find them in the words of men, but in the word of God. He believes them therefore *fide divinâ*: that is to say, on the authority of God who reveals them; and, nevertheless, he cannot stigmatize as a heretic any one who denies them, because the Church, as we have said, has not yet pronounced concerning them her solemn judgment. From this state of truths of faith purely *divine*, they pass on to the other state of truths of *Catholic faith* in virtue of the living magisterium of the Church; and herein also consists that progress which, in these same dogmata, is recognized by S. Vincent of Lerins. There are gradations in this passage: because the living magisterium of the Church is twofold. The one is special; when the Church, at the end of a controversy respecting any dogma, pronounces a solemn sentence of definition or condemnation: the other is ordinary, and is exercised every day in the teaching of her doctors and pastors. In virtue of this second magisterium, a truth may be set forth also as being of *Catholic faith*; or, while remaining of faith *simply divine*, may go on continually approaching nearer and nearer to the further state, until it almost reaches it. Then this will be called a *Catholic truth*, and *proxima fidei* (*catholicæ* understood): without it being yet possible to call the contrary opinion a heresy. This was the case with the dogma of the exemption of Mary from original sin; and the same is now taking place in respect to the Papal infallibility.

For this latter indeed, there is much more to be said. For the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, before it was defined, had against it for a long time the opinion of a very illustrious school, upon which the Church positively refused to allow any stigma to be cast: while the Papal infallibility has no adversary, except the by no means illustrious army of the Gallicans; and is so well supported by the Church, that the error contrary to it has never been allowed to circulate with impunity; as witness the condemnations of the Gallican propositions by Innocent XI. Alexander VIII., and Pius VI., and the horror which those propositions have always excited in the minds of true Catholics. Nay, very grave theologians do not hesitate to call this opinion expressly a heresy, which can only be excused on account of invincible ignorance. In this respect let it suffice to cite the authority of the celebrated Melchior Canus. "I will ask," he says, "if it be heretical to affirm that the Church of Rome also may possibly fall away like the others, and the Apostolic See fall short of the faith of Christ? And I will answer this question briefly. We do not wish to anticipate here the sentence of the Church; but if an error of this kind be proposed before a General Council, the mark of heresy will

be inflicted upon it. . . . Not only reason, not only argument, impels me thus to believe, but also the authority and the eminence of the best theologians. Jerome says that he who does not follow the faith of Peter and of the Roman See is a profane man and a perjurer. Cyprian says that the man is a stranger to us, a profane man, and an enemy, who does not hold the unity of the universal Church, that is to say, that there is one only light from which issue many rays, one only root from which grow many branches, one only fountain from which flow many streams, one only rock on which the Church is built, one only Pontiff who by his authority guides all others; and that the separated ray is extinguished, the torn branch dies, the disunited stream dries up. Thus does he express himself; but one who, in controversies on the faith, leaves the faith and the judgment of the Apostolic See, that man maintains neither unity, nor light, nor root, nor fountain. And the same Cyprian adds, as to one who abandons the Chair of Peter on whom the Church is founded, let not such a man trust that he is in the Church. Ambrose considers that being a Catholic and agreeing with the Church of Rome are altogether one and the same thing. Gregory judges that the authority of the See of Rome must be so entirely followed in matters of religion and of faith, that he who refuses to do so is plucked away from the solid rock on which Christ founded the Church. Leo affirms, that he who dares to withdraw from the solidity of Peter has no share in the divine mysteries; and that it is an impious audacity which attempts to lessen the strength of that rock, which was set up by the hand of God. Nicholas holds that he who struggles to deprive the Roman Church of the privilege conferred upon her by Christ himself, the head of all the Churches, without doubt falls into heresy; because he violates the faith by working against her who is the mother of the faith. Think not lightly, reader, of this judgment of Nicholas, since it was confirmed by the Acts 1 and 7 of the 8th Synod.*

IV.

The very petition of the Bishops against which Dr. Döllinger has his fling, itself shows well what is the feeling of the Church at the present day. Nevertheless we are quite ready to grant, that as yet the opinion contrary to the Papal infallibility must not be called heresy, but only proximate to heresy: for *to constitute formal heresy contumacy is required*, and there is no contumacy against revealed truth without a contradiction of dogmata which have been formally or equivalently defined. This however does not prevent the whole body of the faithful from believing—

* *De Ecclesiæ Rom. Auctoritate*, l. vi. c. 7. In order that there may be no quibbling as to a distinction between the See and its occupant, Melchior Canus in the following chapter rejects that idea in these words: "If we are speaking, as in truth we are speaking, of error in judgments and decrees concerning faith, I find no distinction between the Apostolic See and its occupant." He demonstrates this proposition by many and most powerful arguments, which, for the sake of brevity, we omit, but which any one may refer to in his work.

as in fact they do believe—in this infallibility of the Pope, not only with divine faith but with faith proximate to divine and Catholic faith ; inasmuch as this truth is not only contained in the Deposit of revelation, but is also amply set forth as such by the ordinary magisterium of the Church.

V.

There is next to be noted the falseness of Dr. Döllinger's second argument ; namely, that the definition of Papal infallibility would make a revolution in the belief of the faithful. "What they, the bishops, ask for, is an ecclesiastical revolution, and one which would be all the more radical in so far as it would deal with the foundation on which, for the future, religious faith would have to be established and maintained." So says he ; but this argument, besides the covert insolence of its contradicting nearly the whole of the Council assembled in Rome, is futile in itself and also faulty in its application. It is futile in itself, because it would forbid the Church to define any dogma whatever : it is also wrongly applied, because the question at issue is not a controverted or obscure truth, but a truth which is already, with one trifling exception, a part of the belief and the practice of Catholic nations. The Gallicans themselves, although they deny it in theory, yet recognize it in practice ; since there is not one of them who, if he is sincerely a Catholic, would venture to contradict the utterances of the Pope. The definition of Papal infallibility will therefore bring about a revolution, not—as Dr. Döllinger affirms—in the whole body of the faithful, but solely in the minds of Gallicans ; who will thereby be obliged to give up an error, and will, on that account, be bound to return unceasing thanks to Divine Providence. As to the whole body of Catholics, there would be no revolution, but simply the confirmation and elucidation of a doctrine to which their full assent and adhesion are already given. Clearly, in the act of faith in which Catholics believe in the Church, they believe without a doubt in the Church which was founded by Christ ; that is to say, in the Church which has the Pope for foundation, and the Pope for Teacher and Master. And this is equivalent to an implicit belief in the infallibility of the Pope ; because the foundation of this immovable Church must without a doubt be immovable also, and the master of this infallible Church must be likewise infallible. Therefore the definition of Papal infallibility brings into the act of faith no changes, but only an explanation of that which it already contained ; hence it is not a revolution, but a progress and a development in conformity with Christian belief.

On the contrary, a radical revolution might really be feared in the opposite case, namely, if the infallibility were not to be defined : for Gallicanism, which seemed lately to be extinguished, is undeniably seeking to regain its former strength, and even displays unaccustomed boldness ; from the lecture-room it has betaken itself to the streets, and it is attempting to excite simple-minded men of slender learning, by newspapers full of sophistry and falsehood. Nor is it contented any longer with the bare toleration hitherto conceded to it ; it now claims the same rights as the truth itself, and the power of negotiating on equal terms with

that truth. Nay, it does not stop even at this point; it declares openly that it aspires to drive the truth from its seat and to usurp its place. It even has the audacity to carry out its absurd principles to their extreme consequences, and to declare openly that the supreme authority in the Church is essentially complex; that it does not reside in the Pope, but in the body of chief pastors; that the bishops in a majority have greater power than the Pope, can bind him under Canonical penalties to conform with their decision, and finally have power to depose him. This, as every one can see, is to overturn from head to foot all the organization given by Christ to His Church, and is the substitution of a modern constitutional system for the monarchy established in her by God. Considering the unbridled character of modern thought and the tendency to ignore any authority which has not the people for its origin and source, these ideas are well calculated to gain influence among the people. Hence it is not surprising that the zeal of those holy pastors, to whose care the Deposit of faith has been entrusted, should be moved at the approach of so great a peril, and should have presented the petition which is made the motive of pharisaical scandal to Dr. Döllinger.

VI.

But he says that, if the definition were to take place, the Pope would give testimony to himself. He writes thus:—"The 400 or 600 Bishops at Rome may have decided in 1870 that the Pope is infallible; but all the bishops without the Pope, and every Council without the Pope, are subject to error; infallibility is the prerogative of the Pope alone; bishops, whether few or many, can neither increase nor lessen the strength of his testimony; the decision, therefore, has only just so much of force and of authority as the Pope gives to it, and he it is who makes the decision. Thus at last the whole is summed up in the testimony of the Pope, a very simple affair certainly; only it would be well to recollect that, some 1840 years ago, One who is infinitely greater said, 'If I bear testimony of Myself, My testimony is not true.'"^{*}

If Dr. Döllinger has previously shown himself to be a bad theologian, he shows here that he is a bad interpreter of Scripture. On this occasion Christ, as is well observed by Cornelius à Lapide, is not speaking of his own judgment but of that of the Jews: by a figure of speech he anticipates the objection they might raise by saying to Him, "Your testimony in your own cause is suspicious and does not merit belief;" and He then appeals to the testimony of others; "*alius testimonium perhibet de Me*;" namely, to the testimony of John, of His own miracles, and of Scripture. So also the Pope, on account of the hardness of his adversaries' hearts, often appeals to the testimony of the Fathers, of the facts themselves, of the word of God. Christ also, afterwards, did give testimony to Himself, and that not only before Caiaphas and Pontius Pilate, but also before the Scribes, who were, so to speak, the *Janus* of that day: "*Ego sum lux mundi*," "I am the light of the world"; and when they opposed to Him the very argument of Döllinger, "Thou bearest testimony of Thyself,

^{*} S. John v. 31,

Thy testimony is not true," Christ rejoined, "My testimony is true," "testimonium Meum verum est"; and He added, as a reason, that He was not Alone, but that in Him His Divine Father spoke also: "quia Ego solus non sum, sed Ego et qui misit me Pater." The truth is, that every supreme power has the faculty of giving testimony to itself and of asserting itself. God asserts Himself: "Ego sum qui sum." Christ asserts Himself: "Ego sum Alpha et Omega, principium et finis. Nemo venit ad Patrem nisi per Me," "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. No man cometh unto the Father unless through Me." The Sovereign asserts himself and condemns those who speak against his authority. Parliaments assert themselves, and declare themselves to be the legitimate national representatives. So also the Pope has full right to assert himself, and to declare what are the prerogatives of the power which he has received from Christ. The first example was given by S. Peter when in the Council of Jerusalem he asserted his own authority and declared that, by the ordinance of God, the Gentiles were to receive from his mouth the word of God and to believe; "Ab antiquis diebus Deus in nobis elegit per os meum audire gentes verbum Evangelii et credere." It might well be said that Peter, "sacro approbante concilio," from that day forth had defined the Papal Infallibility. Surely, the mouth from which the people are to receive the word of life, and to which they are bound to give interior assent, cannot be fallacious.

If the argument of Dr. Döllinger were sound, the Church would not be able to define and to assert its own infallibility; for, according to him, no one can bear testimony to himself: and thus we are to be deprived of every rule of faith, and reduced to the private judgment of the Protestants.

VII.

We say, therefore, that the objection of Döllinger is devoid of value; first, because the Pope is most perfectly able by his own power to define the infallibility of his own decrees respecting faith and morals. But in the second place, because it is not from the Pope alone that a definition is now asked for, but from the Council; and it is false that all the testimony of the Council is comprised in the testimony of the Pope. For the authority and infallibility of the Council is not only *Papal*, but *Conciliar* authority and infallibility; in virtue of that universal authority which Jesus Christ gave to Peter, even alone, as the Head, and with him to all the Apostolic College, and consequently to the episcopal body in Catholic unity. And although it be true that this gift, like all others, only belongs to the Ecclesia Docens in the *unity*, of which Peter is the centre and source;—and that by means of unity it all emanates from the Head, and that, objectively speaking, the infallibility of the Pope is prior to the infallibility of the Church;—still, in the present state of the controversy, subjectively and *quoad nos*, what is first known and believed by all is the infallibility of the Church teaching with the Pope, particularly in the Council; and then, as from a thing better known, the knowledge is reached of that which is less known, viz. the infallibility of the Pope also by himself. It is not then here, properly speaking, the Pope who

gives testimony of himself, but it is the Church with the Pope—it is the Council certainly infallible,—which declares the subject of infallibility to be the Pope with the Episcopate, and even the 'Pope alone. But let us proceed to the second part of the article.

VIII.

In this second part Dr. Döllinger attacks the *Postulatum* of the Bishops, and says, first, that “it restricts the infallibility of the Pope to those decisions and decrees which he addresses to the whole body of the faithful.” From which he infers, that for the space of twelve or thirteen centuries the Popes did not use this prerogative of theirs, having during that time directed their decrees to Patriarchs, Bishops, or Emperors, and never to all Christendom.

On reading this objection one is tempted to suspect that Dr. Döllinger does not well understand Latin. For the Bishops in their petition do not say that the Pope is infallible in those decrees *which he addresses to all the faithful*; but that he is infallible in those decrees in which *he lays down and commands* in matters of faith and of morals, *what is to be believed and practised by all the faithful*. In which, as every one must see, there is expressed a universality, as regards the term to which the *object of the definition is referred*, not as regards the term to which the *Apostolic Letter containing the definition is addressed*. These are the words of the *Postulatum*:—“The undersigned Fathers humbly and earnestly beg the holy Œcumenical Council of the Vatican to define clearly, and in words that cannot be mistaken, that the authority of the Roman Pontiff is supreme, and therefore free from error, *when, in matters of faith and morals, he declares and defines what is to be believed and held, and what is to be rejected and condemned by all the faithful*.”* Here it is said that the object which is defined must concern all the faithful, not that the document containing the definition must be addressed to them all. Certainly S. Leo, on the occasion of the heresy of Eutyches, although he addressed his letter to S. Flavian, was treating of a matter which concerned the faith of all Catholics.

IX.

In the second place Dr. Döllinger denies that, according to the universal and constant tradition of the Church, the dogmatic judgments of the Popes are irreformable. And he does not support this colossal negation of his by any other argument, than by the example of the Council of Chalcedon in respect of the letter of S. Leo (which, on the contrary, tells against him) and by that of the fifth and sixth Councils in respect of the *Constitutum* of Vigilius and the Letters of Honorius: objections already answered thousands of times. As we cannot here find room for a long string of quotations, we refer the reader to the magnificent work of Mgr. Manning; in which the illustrious prelate, starting from our own

* “Quum in rebus fidei et morum ea statuit ac præcipit quæ ab omnibus Christifidelibus credenda et tenenda, quæve rejicienda et damnanda sint.”

times and ascending to the very beginnings of Christianity, demonstrates with the clearness of lightning that the dogmatic decisions of the Roman Pontiffs have always and everywhere been regarded in the Church as a rule of faith.

X.

He says in the third place that it is false that in the Second Council of Lyons a profession of faith was admitted, in which it was declared "that disputes concerning the faith should be decided by the Pope." But then, contradicting himself, he concedes the very thing which he has denied: since he adds that that profession of faith was imposed by the Pope upon the Emperor Michael, and inserted by the latter in the letter of acceptance which he caused to be read in the Council. If it was read in the Council without any one objecting to it, it was admitted by the Fathers; who, if they had been of a different opinion, would certainly have been bound to speak on so grave an occasion, when a formula of belief was being imposed with a view to the readmission into the Church of those who were separated therefrom. The Gallicans themselves are satisfied with the tacit consent of Bishops for making Pontifical decisions obligatory. Here, if we had nothing else, we have the tacit consent of the Council of Lyons; and that is enough.

But what Döllinger says of the celebrated decree of the Council of Florence is far more serious. He accuses the petition of the Bishops of having mutilated it, by not quoting the additional clause which follows, and which in the Greek text runs thus:—"In that manner in which it is contained in the Acts both of the Œcumenical Councils and in the sacred canons."* . . . He then adds: "But perhaps he (the drawer-up of the Postulatum) accepts the falsified version (first published by Abraham Bartolomæus), in which an *etiam* takes the place of the *et*? By this *etiam* the sense of the decree is entirely changed, and the scope of this addition completely destroyed; and still this *etiam*, although a palpable falsification, has got introduced into all the collections of Councils and into the books of dogmatic theology; and it is quite time to remove this stone of stumbling for the Orientals, and to re-establish the true text, viz. that which corresponds to the Greek words. But then" (he adds) "the decree would be no longer applicable to the ends of the Infallibilists, as Pietro de Marca, Archbishop of Paris, showed two hundred years ago. The Greek words, understood in their true sense, impose a limit on the exercise of the Pontifical power similar to that which the Gallican Church defends. But from the corrupt reading of the Latin context it results that the power of the Pope is plenary, and that this is proved by the acts of Councils and the Canons."

Here it is impossible to acquit Dr. Döllinger of bad faith, as it is impossible to suppose in him such ignorance as would be required in order to be led astray in this controversy by the intellect alone.

XI.

Firstly, it is a canon of interpretation which is dictated by common

* "*Quemadmodum et in actis conciliorum et sacris canonibus continetur.*"

sense, that a subsequent sentence in which there is any ambiguity must not be interpreted so as to contradict the previous one, which is clear and express. This being premised, however we may choose to read the additional clause which Dr. Döllinger says ought to have been cited in the Postulatum of the Bishops, it cannot be understood as a restriction of the preceding sentence, because it would then pervert its meaning altogether. Now in the first part of the decree it was defined that "the Pope is on earth the Vicar of Christ, Head of the whole Church, and Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that in the person of Blessed Peter he has received from Christ full power to feed, rule, and govern the Universal Church." It would be impossible to use clearer or more explicit words, to express the monarchical form of government of the Church; according to which the supreme power resides in the Roman Pontiff alone. How then can it be admitted that the second part restricts this power in the sense of the Gallicans,—for whom the Government of the Church is no longer purely monarchical, but mixed, or, to speak more correctly, aristocratic; and the supreme power, that of judging with an irreformable judgment, resides, not in the Pope, but only in the Church? Did the Council sanction a self-contradictory decree, and call the power of the Pope plenary and not plenary? supreme and dependent? And this becomes all the more absurd, when the plenary power is said to be conferred upon the Pope by *Christ*, and the restriction is said to be imposed by the *canons*: as if the canons were of more force than Christ, and could modify the work of Christ! The words then of the second part cannot in any way be understood as a restriction of that which was admitted in the first; but at the most can only be understood as expressing the use of that plenary power which is recognized as existing in the Pope; in the sense in which the Sovereign also is subject to the laws, not *quoad vim coactivam* (so as to be obliged by them), but only *quoad vim directivam* (so as to be directed by them), as the Jurists say.

But not even this interpretation can be put upon the clause in question. The only true interpretation is that it is nothing more than a corroboration of that which goes before. This is admitted by Dr. Döllinger (and how could he do otherwise than admit it?). In the hypothesis that the true reading of this second part is "*Quemadmodum etiam, &c.*," which words amount to this, that the Acts also and Canons of Councils recognize in the Pope those prerogatives which had just been affirmed. Now the fact is precisely this: the undeniably true reading is that of "*etiam*." This has been victoriously proved by Mamachi and Zaccaria, by an examination of the original texts; and we might justly have contented ourselves with their demonstrations. However, wishing for more personal and tangible proof we betook ourselves to the Vatican Library, and obtained from its distinguished custodian Mgr. Martinucci all the codices in which the Acts of the Council of Florence are to be found. These are the Codices 4128, 4193, 4136, 4037, all of the fifteenth century and quite near to the date of the Council. The Codex 4193 contains the autograph MS. of the History of the Council of Basle by Agostino Patrizi, and the Decree of the Council of Florence is also reproduced there; but it finishes precisely where the disputed text commences. So far were people then from thinking that

this belonged to the text of the decree, as Dr. Döllinger affirms. In the other three, that is, in 4037, page 113; 4128, page 73; 4136, page 164; we ourselves, with our own eyes have read, and with our own hands have most faithfully copied the readings, which are here reproduced under the numbers of the respective codices :—

4037 *quod etiam in greco*

4128 *quod etiam in greco*

4136 *quod etiam in greco*

In No. 4037 the “etiam” is abbreviated, and the sign of the abbreviation is as clear as possible; but by that abbreviation we can understand how easily the “etiam” may have got changed into “et” in some codices and some more recent books.

But this is nothing in comparison of the fourth document. From the Vatican Library we descended to the archives of the Vatican Basilica. Here is preserved one of the *originals* of the decree of union; a most precious and well-known record, of which Orazio Giustiniani Schelstrate, Cardinal Pitra, Padre, Colenzi, and others have treated. We were allowed by the courteous Archivist to take it in our hands, and study it at our ease. It is a parchment 2 palms and 9 ells in height, and 3 palms and 1 ell in breadth, in an admirable state of preservation. It is divided into two columns: in the right-hand column is the Latin text in a fine semi-Gothic character, and in the left, the Greek text, written, after the manner of that time, with most difficult nexus throughout. At the foot of the Latin column is the autograph signature of Eugenius and several Cardinals; at the foot of the Greek column the autograph signature of John Palæologus; and below the signature of the Pope his seal is impressed; and besides this there is the leaden bulla with SS. Peter and Paul on its face, and Eugenius PP. IIII. on its reverse. Now in this very original is to be read in the plainest letters, and at full length, that word “Etiam,” which Dr. Döllinger has asserted to be a falsification of the XVIth century! Here it is reproduced in an exact and faithful copy :—

quemadmo

sum etiam in actis ycuemcoris Conabof
et in sacris canonibus continetur

Just as the “etiam” is to be read here, so is it also to be read in the other

original exemplars preserved at Florence,* Bologna, and Paris: as may be seen in Schelstrate in the preface to his treatise on the Council of Constance. And the readings of the original texts of a solemn and well-known document being thus identical, we may be certain that all the most ancient and most correct codices reproduce the "etiam": and we have a proof of it in all the Vatican codices; and in almost all the printed books; and in all the editions of the Council of Florence, of which there are at least nine, five of which, the Roman, the three Parisian, and the Venetian, have been edited with the most careful criticism, and after collation of the best codices and notation of variantia. And such a reading as this, of the genuineness of which nobody but a madman could doubt, Dr. Döllinger calls a palpable falsification, by which the whole Church has been deceived!

But it will be said, why stand by the Latin text and not rather by the Greek, which, in the place corresponding to the *quemadmodum etiam* of the Latin has καθ' ὃν τρόπον καὶ, which must be translated "ad eum modum qui et"—"in such manner as is contained (both) in," or "is (also) contained in," what follows?

We answer, first: Why should we stand by the Greek text and not the Latin, when both are equally originals? But not even this is true, since the Greek text was a translation from the Latin, and the latter is consequently the more original of the two. We assert this because it appears from the narrative of Andrea da S. Croce, which is incorporated in the Acts of the Councils, that the formulæ of the decree of union were proposed by the Latins, and, after discussion, accepted by the Greeks. And this was principally the case as regards that part of the decree which concerns the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, of which Cardinal Giulio Cesarini says: "Then, the Divine Mercy so disposing it, it came to pass that the Greeks gave their assent in accordance with the draft proposed by the

* In the case of Florence, the Rev. Canon Cecconi at our request has consulted a still more precious original; that, namely, which was the first of the first five, and is religiously preserved in the Biblioteca Laurenziana. In this, besides the autograph signatures of Pope Eugenius and Palæologus, there are the autograph signatures of all the Fathers, both Latin and Greek, who were present at the Council, with the leaden bulla of the Pope, and the golden one of the Emperor. See the description of it which Canon Cecconi himself gives in a letter inserted in the "Armonia" of 1 Feb., 1870. Now in this most authoritative original the "*Quemadmodum etiam*" in question is written at full length. It is further worth noticing that, as Canon Cecconi writes to us, in the Greek text of this original also that which Mgr. Maret attests with respect to the Paris original is to be verified: namely, the absence of the preposition *ἐν* from the second division of the second member of the period; so that it runs thus: καθ' ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν συνοδῶν, καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς κανόσι διαλαμβάνεται. Now Mgr. Maret adduces the authority of a Hellenist whom he had consulted, who affirms that if in the second division of the phrase the preposition *ἐν* is not repeated,—so that it reads καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς, and not καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς—in that case the particle καὶ in the first division must necessarily be translated by *etiam*. (Du Concile Général et de la Paix religieuse vol. i. p. 490.)

Latins.”* Besides, even if the two texts were of equal authority, every rule of sound criticism demands that the rule of interpretation should be taken from the one according to which both the texts become concordant, and not from that according to which they would exhibit a certain discrepancy. Now if we take the Latin for our rule, this perfect harmony is obtained; for the *καθ’ ὃν τρόπον* can perfectly be rendered as *quemadmodum*, and the *καὶ* bears equally well the sense of *etiam*, and can have no other if, as is just, we prefer the reading of the Greek text, in which the preposition *ἐν* is not repeated. Lastly, S. Antoninus, who, as Archbishop of Florence, was one of the leading members of that Council, expressly attests that the Fathers by this phrase intended to express that the teaching of tradition agreed with that of Holy Scripture, to which the first part of the decree referred; and Turrecremata, also present at the Council, in his Treatise on the Decree of Union, observes that, in the first member of the period in question, the authority of the Roman Pontiff is established according to the rule given in the Divine Scriptures, while in the second member the same is corroborated by the records of tradition.†

XII.

We have said enough of this most fallacious article of Dr. Döllinger’s; since what he adds against the legitimacy of the Council of Florence is all stuff which he has taken bodily from Mark of Ephesus, and has been already confuted over and over again even by the more sensible Greeks themselves. It is a remarkable fact that the science of Dr. Döllinger is almost always borrowed from schismatic or Protestant writers. Moreover, what he says against that Council does not overthrow, but rather confirms the argument of the petition; since what it demands is that the Council should come to such an express definition of the Pontifical infallibility as can leave no possible room for doubt, precisely because the enemies of the doctrine do not shrink from denying the Œcumenicity of the Florentine Council which has implicitly affirmed it.

Dr. Döllinger is far advanced in years. If then he does not disdain our counsel, we will beseech him to turn his thoughts a little to the Divine judgment; and to consider if he can present himself before Christ with an untroubled spirit, when by his deeds and writings he attacks the most glorious prerogative of His representative upon earth.

Just as we are going to press, we find the following most important Pontifical Letter addressed to Dom Guéranger.

Dilecto filio Prospero Guéranger, e Congregatione Benedictina Galliarum, Abbati Solesmensi.

PIUS PP. IX.

Dilecte fili, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Dolendum profecto est,

* “Deinde disponente divinâ pietate, factum est ut assentirent Graeci secundum cedulam datam per Latinos.” (Acta Conc. Col., 22, n. 9.)

† [On this “Quemadmodum” clause we would also refer our readers to our own remarks in April, 1866, pp. 509—524; and pp. 550—555. ED. D.R.]

dilecte filii, nonnullos esse inter catholicos, qui dum hoc nomine gloriantur, vitiatissimis imbuti principiis adeo præfracte istis adherent, ut non modo plane subijcere nesciant intellectum adverso hujus sanctæ Sedis judicio, communi etiam Episcoporum assensu et commendatione roborato; sed imo censentes societatis humanæ progressum et felicitatem illis omnino niti, Ecclesiam inclinare conentur ad sententiam suam, seque solum sapere arbitrati reliquam omnem catholicorum familiam aliter sentientem ultramontanæ partis nomine designare non erubescant.

Quam quidem insaniam eo compellunt, ut divinam ipsam Ecclesiæ constitutionem refingere aggrediantur et exigere ad recentiores civilis regiminis modos; quo supremi Rectoris ei a Christo præpositi facilius deprimant auctoritatem, cujus prerogativas expavescent. Quamobrem perniciosas quasdam doctrinas sæpius improbatas audacter in medium proferunt, uti indubias aut saltem plane liberas; corradunt e veteribus earum propugnatoribus captiunculas historicas, mutila scriptorum testimonia, calumnias Romanis Pontificibus affectas, sophismata quævis; eaque omnia, sepositis omnino solidis argumentis quibus centies explosa sunt, impudentissimi regerunt: eo spectantes, ut animos commoveant, suæque factionis homines et imperitorum vulgus adversus communem cæterorum sententiam incitent.

Quo sane incepto, præter damnum invectæ perturbationis fidelium et detractarum ad trivia gravissimarum quæstionum, insipientiam audaciæ, parem deplorare cogimur. Nam si firmiter cum cæteris catholicis tenerent (Ecumenicam Synodum a Spiritu Sancto regi, soloque Ejus afflatu definire ac proponere quæ credenda sunt, nunquam in animum inducerent, vel ea definiri posse uti de fide* quæ revelata revera non sunt aut obsint Ecclesiæ, vel humanas artes impedimento esse posse Spiritus Sancti virtuti, quominus ea quæ revelata sunt et Ecclesiæ utilia definiantur.

Vetitum certe non ducerent, eâ qua decet ratione proponi Patribus difficultates quas huic aut illi definitioni obstare arbitrantur, ut lucidior e disceptatione veritas emergeret; at uno hujus acti studio, prorsus abstinere ab artibus quibus captari solent in comitiis populi suffragia, tranquillique et reverentes expectarent supernæ illustrationis effectum. Utilissimam igitur operam Ecclesiæ te impendisse censuimus, qui præcipua ex ejusmodi scriptis refellenda suscepisti, eorumque similitudinem, violentiam et artes eâ soliditate demonstrasti, eo nitore, eâ sacræ archæologiæ scientiæque ecclesiasticæ copiâ, ut, plurima paucis complexus, præstigium omne sapientiæ abjudicaveris iis qui sententias involvebant sermonibus imperitis; restitutâque veritate fidei, juris, et historiæ, cultis inductisque fidelibus consulueris. Pergratum itaque tibi ob oblatum volumen profitemur animum; exitumque faustum et amplissimum ominamur lucubrationi tuæ. Ejus vero auspiciis et paternæ nostræ benevolentiae pignus Apostolicam Benedictionem tibi peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum die 12 martii 1870, Pontificatus Nostri Anno XXIV.

PIUS PP. IX.

* Some translations of this Letter have omitted the words "uti de fide," and thereby materially affected the meaning of the sentence. [Ed. D.R.]

Notices of Books.

When does the Church speak Infallibly? By THOMAS FRANCIS KNOX, of the Oratory. 1867.

Del Magistero Infallibile della Chiesa. Opuscolo di TOMMASO FRANCESCO KNOX, dell' Oratorio, tradotto dall' inglese. 1870.

WE have read with extreme pleasure the criticism on F. Knox's admirable pamphlet, which appeared in February in the "*Civiltà*." We cannot do better than place the whole before our readers :—

"We have only just received this little book, which treats of a subject of present interest ; but we will not delay noticing it. The best way to give an account of this excellent work will be to insert at full length the introduction to the translation.

"*To the reader.*—Now that the Council has excited such a lively and pressing interest in the fundamental doctrine of Infallibility, we want a good treatise, learned and yet popular, short and yet full, on the whole question : a book of this kind ought to be written, and, if well done, translated into different languages, and widely circulated. But who is to write it ? for the task is harder than at first sight appears. Such was the opinion recently expressed in conversation by several pious and learned ecclesiastics. But, interposed one of them, the book already exists, at least in English. It was written by F. Knox, three years ago, when Superior of the London Oratory, at the time when the controversy about infallibility was at its height ; and it was very successful. Dr. Murray, of the College of Maynooth in Ireland, had handled the subject scholastically in his great treatise de Ecclesiâ. Dr. Ward had discussed it with greater fulness controversially in the DUBLIN REVIEW. F. Knox, availing himself of their labours, followed a simpler method ; and, avoiding all scholastic and controversial expressions, produced a work, at once learned and popular, brief yet full ; the very quintessence, so to speak, of doctrinal exposition. His little book, so well suited at the time to England, has come to be of general interest at the present moment. This then is the work to translate ;—F. Knox's work. These learned ecclesiastics did not take long to run through the treatise, and soon came to an unanimous agreement that it was the very thing they wanted. Why write another book ? they said. Herein are treated the "subject" of infallibility, viz., the episcopate under the Pope and the Pope ; the "object" of infallibility, both primary and secondary, in all its branches ; the various ways in which the infallible teaching is communicated ; the nature of its definitions and condemnations ; and the obligation which it imposes. What more is needed ? Everything is in this book, and all is well done. Not of course that this is the only good book on the subject ; for the Council has led to the publication of other very good

books. Still this is first-rate in itself, and is on the whole the best we could choose. Something perhaps might be added to it, and something pruned away; but it is better to leave it as it is. It does not say much on the great question, which has just sprung up, about the Pope's infallibility, and still less about the opportuneness of its definition; for when it was written, the "object" of Infallibility was more discussed than its "subject." However, under the general head of the infallibility of the Church it says enough of the infallibility of the Pope. Besides there is an advantage in the circumstance that this treatise was written before the present discussion began; for what is now wanted is not a controversial but a doctrinal work, quite free from polemical tinge, and assailing no one. Enough. The book wanted is found. The translation is ready. To press then with it. Now you know, good reader, how and why the translation of this treatise has made its appearance. Read it, and you will be satisfied, we hope, that we were right.

"Thus far the preface:—To show what our own opinion is, we will only state a fact. When F. Knox's little book first appeared, we were so much pleased with it, that we intended not merely to review it, but to give an epitome of it in our pages, as we did with Mgr. Manning's Letter on the Centenary; and nothing but extrinsic reasons made us lay aside or rather defer our purpose, and wait for the translation. As it is, we rejoice that it has been translated just now, at a conjuncture when its publication is so much more opportune. Let this suffice in praise of the book. We will only add, in praise of the translator, that he has done his part so well, that it reads more like an original than a translation."

F. Knox's pamphlet has also been noticed in a very silly article in the current "Quarterly Review." When we formerly reviewed it, we were at the height of our controversy with F. Ryder, and we considered the pamphlet almost exclusively in its relation to that controversy. We will now give a general analysis of its contents.

The author begins (pp. 1-7) with explaining the singular blessedness which Catholics derive from the Church's infallibility. Adam indeed, in his original state, was intrinsically incapable of forming any erroneous judgment. But the freedom from error enjoyed by Catholics flows from extrinsic not intrinsic causes, being based on the Church's infallibility; so that mankind possesses the liberty, which multitudes indeed disastrously exercise, of rejecting God's gift and plunging headlong into error. Catholics are better advised; and are preserved accordingly from intellectual delusions, not indeed on all matters whatsoever, but on those many and most momentous of all whereon the Church has spoken. F. Knox's first inquiry then is, *whose* utterance is to be accounted the *Church's* speaking; "in what person or persons does her gift of infallibility reside?" (p. 8.)

Look first at the Apostles themselves (pp. 10-13). S. Peter is set forth in Scripture as having received special promises individually, and an office in which others do not share; while on two occasions authority is given to all the Apostles, *including* S. Peter. Still "the powers they received in common with Peter could not undo the exceptional powers which Peter alone had received" (p. 12). "Peter's jurisdiction," therefore, "was personal and independent of his fellow Apostles; while theirs was collegiate under him, and, as regards their individual exercise of it, wholly dependent upon him" (ib.).

But "what became of these two centres,"—it might be more apt perhaps to say "organs"—"of jurisdiction when the Apostles died?" (p. 13). "The individual Apostles, with the exception of Peter, left no one to succeed them; but, as the Apostolic College, in their corporate capacity," the bishops, teaching and governing in union with the successors of S. Peter, are in every age successors of the Apostles.

The following passage is admirably expressed, and of profound interest at the present moment.

"It is an article of the Catholic faith that the bishops of the Universal Church, under the Pope, are infallible in their pronouncements, when they speak as teachers of the faith to the flock of Christ. It matters not whether they teach collectively as they do when they are assembled in Œcumenical Council, or whether they address individually the several portions of the flock intrusted to each. What they all teach in either way is infallibly the truth, provided always that their teaching is in strict conformity with the teaching of the Sovereign Pontiff, their head. Pertinaciously to deny this would be to incur the guilt of heresy, and to forfeit the hope and name of Christian. It is not, however, of faith that the Pope alone is infallible; that is to say, it does not involve the sin of heresy to deny the personal infallibility of the Pope. For the doctrine of the Papal infallibility has not as yet been formally declared by the Church to be a dogma of the faith and contained in the revealed deposit. But there are many truths of which we may be certain, though we cannot have the highest kind of certainty concerning them,—that of Divine faith. And again, there are doctrines which the Church, for prudential reasons, may not have seen fit to brand by a distinct sentence as erroneous, but about which she has so clearly manifested her mind that she cannot be said to regard them even as tolerated.* Such a one, as we shall now show, is the opinion denying the Pope's personal infallibility" (pp. 15, 16).

F. Knox proceeds to illustrate this statement by an historical account of the Gallican articles (pp. 19, 20). In particular (p. 20) he draws attention to the very important fact, that those of the French clergy, who had taken part in the Assembly of 1682 and were afterwards nominated bishops, could not obtain institution from Innocent XII., till they had declared to that Pontiff that they "grieved from their heart exceedingly, and beyond what could be expressed, for the things done in the Assembly of 1682."

The second question considered by F. Knox (pp. 24-48) is the object-matter of the Church's infallibility. This question is solved by the simple process of observing what extent of infallibility the Church has *claimed*; because of course it is *involved* in her infallibility, that she cannot claim a power which she does not possess. By applying this practical method, our author arrives very easily and safely at the conclusion, that the Church teaches infallibly "not only the truths directly revealed by our Blessed Lord to His Apostles whether explicitly or implicitly, but also every other branch of truth, speculative or practical, which has any bearing on revealed truth" (p. 27). He then proceeds to specify various particulars contained in this general statement. Thus the Church is infallible in "truths explicitly or

* We slightly demur to this expression. Surely the Church as yet *tolerates* Gallicanism: though she accords it *no more than bare toleration*. [Ed. D. R.]

implicitly contained in the original revelation"; (2) in all principles of morality (p. 31); (3) in dogmatical and moral facts (p. 31); (4) in political truths and principles, no less than (5) in philosophy and natural sciences, so far as these bear upon faith and morals; and (6) in theological conclusions. Dogmatical and moral facts again are subdivided by F. Knox into (1) the meaning of books in relation to the Faith; (2) the canonization of Saints; (3) general ecclesiastical discipline and worship; (4) approbation of religious orders; (5) condemnation of secret and other societies; (6) education; and (7) "facts which involve a principle of morality and its concrete expression" (p. 42). Never was there given a more complete and exhaustive enumeration; never a more hearty protest against the fundamental error, which would confine infallibility to definitions of faith.

"The object-matter of the Church's infallibility embraces primarily and directly all revealed truth, whether explicitly or implicitly contained in the revealed deposit; and secondarily and indirectly all natural truths, both of fact and speculation, which stand in such relation to revealed truth that error concerning them would tend to impair the integrity of the faith in the minds of Christians and to imperil their eternal salvation" (p. 53).

Thirdly F. Knox inquires, by what methods and instruments the Church fulfils her office of thus infallibly teaching her children. Normally she does so (p. 57) by "a direct and personal action exerted on them one by one." She provides seminaries for the orthodox education of her clergy, and by means of her clergy she reaches her whole flock. Moreover her ritual and liturgy, her devotions, discipline, laws, and a multitude of similar things, bring home to the faithful a large body of truth.

But how does she teach her flock under exceptional circumstances? how does she guard it "against the invasion and corrupting influence of erroneous doctrines"? It will often suffice if she merely "impresses more earnestly than usual upon her children in her every-day teaching the doctrines of the faith which have been specially impugned."

"It was in this way that during the first three centuries of the Christian era, when persecution was incessantly winnowing out from among the faithful all half-hearted members, many heresies were withered up, and brought to an untimely end. And so too in the Middle Ages, when the whole framework of society was moulded upon the Faith, and in every department of speculation the truths of faith were regarded as absolute certainties to which all else must bend, erroneous doctrines were sometimes held in check for a long time, if not finally eradicated, by the mere force of the Church's daily teaching and personal influence" (pp. 59, 60).

But on the other hand heresies and errors will often arise, which, for various reasons, cannot be thus duly resisted by the Church's ordinary magisterium, but require special condemnation. This she sometimes pronounces by an Œcumenical Council. But such interventions must necessarily be rare, as Councils are but exceptions in the Church's history; and the ordinary instrument of censure has ever been Pontifical *ex cathedrâ* teaching. "The Sovereign Pontiff from the Chair of Peter has never ceased to lift up his warning voice time after time, in condemnation of the errors which

were threatening the flock, and to proclaim anew the truths which the world was in danger of forgetting."

As to the form of these *ex cathedra* utterances, no general rule can be laid down (p. 63.). At one period of history Popes ordinarily used Bulls for that purpose; but of late they have preferred to speak in Allocutions and Apostolic Letters; whether the latter be Encyclical, or (as is often the case) addressed in form to individual bishops, though given for the instruction of the whole Church. F. Knox further argues (p. 66) from Pius IX.'s language in the "*Quantà curà*," that all the Apostolic Letters cited in the Syllabus were put forth *ex cathedra*.

Fourthly, by what standard does the Church adjust her various censures of error? Exclusively by the Deposit of Faith and the principles of the moral law. According to the different ways in which errors deflect from this standard, is the particular censure with which she brands them.

Fifthly, what obligation does the Church's infallible teaching impose on Catholics? It obliges them to absolute interior assent under pain of mortal sin (p. 83).

F. Knox concludes with some excellent answers to one or two specious objections, which may be urged against this or that portion of his doctrine.

What especially impresses us in his pamphlet, is its completeness and equable balance. The dogma of infallibility has greatly suffered, from the fragmentary way in which it has been treated. Several writers, in defending orthodox doctrine on the "subject" of infallibility, have carelessly fallen into most inaccurate and dangerous statements on the extent of its "object." Several again, who have treated the infallibility of doctrinal *decrees*, have seemed to forget the Church's infallibility in her ordinary *magisterium*, and the indefectible purity of Roman tradition. F. Knox has had (as one may say) the whole map of his subject spread open before him from first to last. We heartily hope that the warm praise now bestowed on his work by so authoritative a journal as the "*Civiltà*" will induce those interested in the subject—and what educated Catholic can be otherwise than deeply interested therein?—unless he has already studied the work, to give it his most earnest and heedful attention.

Les Contradictions de Monseigneur Maret. Par M. le P. HENRI RAMIÈRE, S.J. Paris: Palmé.

A DOGMA so practical as that of Pontifical infallibility cannot but be exposed to some superficial difficulties, when confronted with the entire history of the past. What Ultramontanes say is, that whereas *their* dogma is exposed to certain *difficulties*, any *different* doctrine which can be named is encountered by irrefragable historical *disproofs*. Gallicans have generally shown themselves to be aware of this; and have accordingly avoided with instinctive care any consistent doctrinal statement whatever on their own side. Janus again—who is no more a Gallican than Dean

Stanley is a Gallican—has confined himself almost exclusively (as we pointed out in our last number) to the ground of mere objection. We are very glad therefore to express our sense of Mgr. Maret's merits in this respect. He is a Catholic in belief, which Janus is not : and he is hardly more Janus's superior in orthodoxy, than in manliness and straightforwardness. He has exhibited a positive theory, and endeavoured to establish that theory by facts.

One reason why this boldness does him honour is, that it necessarily lays him open to so much more effective attack : and we must say that in all our controversial experience—which has not been inconsiderable—we doubt if we have [ever seen so simply annihilating] a rejoinder, as F. Ramière's which we are here to notice.

The first contradiction of Mgr. Maret, signaled by his opponent, is this. The Bishop protests against any attempt to revolutionize the Church's constitution ; and this indeed is his very reason for protesting so energetically against a definition of Pontifical infallibility. Then, having made this protest, he proceeds himself to propose—and some such proposal is indeed necessary for reducing his theory into practice *at all*—that the Pope shall be bound to assemble an Œcumenical Council every ten years, and that all matters of high importance shall be reserved for these periodical assemblies. He adds (Ramière, pp. 15, 30) that if any Pope did not submit his judgment to the large majority of such a Council, he would jure divino cease to be Pope. Is it Mgr. Maret's *opponents* then, asks F. Ramière, or Mgr. Maret's *supporters*, who are endeavouring to revolutionize the Church's constitution ? All which Ultramontanes desire (p. 17) is that "the assembled Episcopate shall sanction theoretically, what the dispersed Episcopate has ever during the gravest crises recognized practically." That which Mgr. Maret desires is, that a discipline hitherto unknown shall be practised, and a doctrine hitherto unknown shall be proclaimed.

The second contradiction is founded on Mgr. Maret's statement that, on his view, the Church's divinely appointed constitution is "monarchy tempered by aristocracy" (p. 23). Why, according to the Bishop's proposal, not only the Pope can by himself do no one sovereign act, but he does not even possess a veto on the decisions of the Episcopate. To call such a constitution *monarchical*, is simply to throw dust into his readers' eyes : and yet Mgr. Maret naturally enough shrinks from avowing, that he does not consider the Church to be a *monarchy at all*.

The third contradiction is similar. No Catholic can be *obliged*, says Mgr. Maret, either in matters of belief or of practice, except by the united authority of the Pope and of the large majority of the Episcopate. We refer to F. Ramière's pages for various difficulties involved in this statement : we will only mention one. The Bishop places *the Pope himself* under a yoke, from which he exempts the humblest Catholic. *Other* Catholics can only be bound by Pope united with bishops ; but *the Pope* is irreformably bound by the bishops acting in direct opposition to his judgment (pp. 29-40).

The fourth contradiction concerns the Bishop's appeal to Scripture (pp.

42-58). He founds his argument in great part on the authority of Scripture, whereas he is really in point-blank and almost grotesque *opposition* to the inspired word. All Catholics hold that the Pope and bishops united are supreme: *Ultramontanes* further hold, that Pope apart from Bishops is supreme; while *Mgr. Maret* holds, that bishops apart from Pope are supreme. Now Scripture testifies expressly that the Apostles were supreme when united with S. Peter; and also that S. Peter was supreme apart from the other Apostles. But as to the other Apostles apart from S. Peter, no one Scriptural text can be alleged which gives them any supreme authority at all.

The fifth contradiction turns on the famous Decree of Constance. On Ultramontane principles, argues F. Ramière, the Decree presents no difficulty whatever; whereas on Mgr. Maret's principles, it ignominiously refutes—Mgr. Maret himself. Let us take those points in order.

There is one particular so interesting and important, that it is worth mentioning though in no degree essential to F. Ramière's argument. It is commonly said that the Decree of Constance ascribed to a Council superiority over a Pope, in all those things which relate "*ad fidem et extirpationem presentis schismatis*." But it is pretty certain (p. 68) that the true reading is not "*fidem*" but "*finem*"; and that the superiority ascribed is on those things only, which relate "to the *end* and extirpation of the present schism."

But however this may be, argues F. Ramière, to Ultramontanes the Decree of Constance presents no kind of difficulty: for the decrees of a Council are only so far authoritative as they may have been confirmed by a Pope. Now no such confirmation is even alleged in the present instance, except that of Martin V.; who (p. 68) ratified those decrees which had been *conciliarly* enacted at Constance in the *materia* of faith. Now (p. 64) Eugenius IV., Martin V.'s immediate successor, emphatically declared that those decrees were not to be accounted "*conciliar*," which were ratified only by bishops of one obedience. And we may add on our own part, that this fact has special weight with those who, like ourselves, consider that John XXIII. was not a true Pope and had no power therefore of summoning a council. Then secondly (p. 65) Peter d'Ailly—one of the strongest anti-Papalists—himself admits that, in consequence of the mode of voting adopted at Constance, many persons considered the Decree of the Council not to have been enacted "*conciliarly*." And this is most intelligible; for (p. 70) the votes of married laymen were received, and even counted on an equality with the votes of bishops. And finally (p. 66) Eugenius IV. declared as a matter of fact—what if true he must necessarily have known—that Martin V. never did intend to confirm the particular Decree on which Gallicans lay stress.

But while Mgr. Maret's arguments entirely fail to touch his opponents, they are simply fatal to *himself*. He maintains (Ramière, p. 75) that the Decree of Constance possesses precisely the same authority with the Tridentine capitula,* and is therefore the Church's infallible utterance

* It is gratifying to find F. Ramière and Mgr. Maret in complete accord-

"touching on matters of faith." In reply to this, F. Ramière points out with most telling effect (pp. 78—84) the singularly strong language used by the greatest theologians on the absolute certainty of the Ultramontane dogma. In particular he points out, that no canonized saint can be named in any subsequent age of the Church, who maintained the Decree of Constance as understood by Gallicans. Mgr. Maret then must allege—if he would be consistent—that a certain doctrine, infallibly taught by the Church in an Œcumenical Council, has been rejected by the whole series of succeeding Popes, by the enormous majority of Catholic bishops and priests, and by every canonized saint without exception. But Mgr. Maret is far too loyally-intentioned a Catholic to dream of making such an allegation as this; which would be acceptable indeed to a Dollinger or a Janus, but intolerable to a Maret or a Dupanloup. Here then we have Mgr. Maret's fifth contradiction.

We pass over F. Ramière's sixth chapter: not because it is in any way inferior to the rest; but because it extends over too wide ground to be satisfactorily summarized. It treats, among other matters, with great clearness and force, the various relevant questions which have been raised concerning the Councils of Basle and of Florence.

We heartily recommend those of our readers who would master the Gallican controversy, to procure this volume and study it carefully. It only extends to 161 pages; and yet we have no real work, in which the shallow and contemptible Gallican tenets have received a reply, at one so exhaustive, and of such intense and sustained interest.

Première Lettre à Mgr. Dechamps. Par A. GRATRY. Paris: Douniol.

IT is a curious fact, that Mr. Renouf's last pamphlet on Pope Honorius seems almost to have died in its birth, while F. Gratry's on the same subject has caused so great a sensation. Mr. Renouf is profoundly versed in the literature of the subject, while F. Gratry's ignorance on the whole matter is simply astounding; Mr. Renouf draws out real arguments of a certain kind, while F. Gratry seems not to understand what reasoning means; nay even as regards language and tone, F. Gratry has managed (which might have seemed impossible) to exceed Mr. Renouf in violence and bitterness. The Ultramontane doctrine is "a long tradition of lying and fraud" (p. 38); the Ultramontane school is "founded on passion, blindness, excitement" (p. 35); in its arguments "there is neither

ance, that the Tridentine capitula are infallible; and that any one who denies their teaching, though not on that account actually *heretical*, yet "sins mortally" (gravement) against the obedience due to the Church's sovereign authority. On this point adds F. Ramière (p. 78) "*there is not and cannot be any discrepancy among Catholic theologians.*"

knowledge, nor reason, nor discussion, nor attention, nor any intellectual operation whatever" (p. 37); the Breviary, sanctioned by innumerable successive Pontiffs, presents an instance of "audacious chicanery" which has never been exceeded in history (p. 77). All this is but an instance of the kind of language which has lately been put forth by Gallicans, and on which in some early number we shall probably be tempted to comment.

The Abbé Chantrel, in his admirable reply ("Le Pape Honorius"), points out that this is the violence of a recent convert, or rather pervert. In 1859 (p. 16) F. Gratry regretted that Catholics in general did not "pay greater attention to that man [the Holy Father] whom Jesus Christ has placed in the centre of renewed humanity"; that they did not more profoundly "meditate on his proceedings, and on the words which he addresses to the Church as her head and her teacher." By so doing, he added, they might "at length discover the actual will of God, the direction of that movement which God desires to impress on the world." In an earlier work he had said expressly that "*almost all* Catholics believe, and *all* admit in practice, that the Sovereign Pontiff is infallible when he judges *ex cathedrâ* on faith and morals." Whatever else may be said of his present views, they do not present the recommendation of having been matured by long years of thought and reflection.

Those of our readers who care to look through F. Gratry's treatment of the Honorius question, will find that it contains no one argument, which we have not amply considered in our reply to Mr. Renouf, which was in type before F. Gratry appeared. We will here only advert to one particular; which has surprised us even in F. Gratry, and much more in Mr. Renouf. There is undoubtedly a certain allegation against the orthodoxy of Honorius's *ex cathedrâ* teaching, which may be made with a certain superficial plausibility; for he may be accused of having taught *ex cathedrâ*, that the phrase "two energies" is an inappropriate expression of Catholic dogma. We consider indeed that we have irrefragably refuted this charge in the DUBLIN REVIEW; but what we are now saying is, that it is the only charge which deserves the compliment of a refutation. Never was there an allegation more incredibly absurd, than that made by Mr. Renouf, and (with characteristic feebleness) by F. Gratry; viz. that Honorius taught *ex cathedrâ* the Monothelite heresy. No one, Catholic, Protestant or infidel, has ever doubted, that Duothelism was at that time the doctrine of the whole West. These sapient anti-Papalists* then are encumbered with a somewhat paradoxical case. According to them, Honorius was zealous indeed, so far as the *East* was concerned, for what he accounted the orthodox dogma; but he was at the same time so profoundly indifferent to its interests in the *West*, that he took no single step to exterminate what he considered heresy even from his own immediate diocese. In fact, in the view of these gentlemen, it was Honorius's design that orthodoxy should universally prevail in the East and heresy in the West; except

* We do not say "Gallicans," because we wish we could see any reason for supposing that Mr. Renouf holds, as Gallicans hold, the infallibility of the *Ecclesia Docens*.

indeed that he himself abandoned the Western for the Eastern dogma. These forsooth are the critics, who deride Ultramontanes as being un-historical! These are the critics, who allege that Ultramontanes distort facts for the sake of a theory!

F. Gratry's opponents had a very easy task before them, in replying to his puerilities; but they have done their work as carefully as though they had not to contend with a mere man of straw. We have already mentioned the Abbé Chantrel. The "*Civiltà*" has contributed a most admirable and complete paper on the subject; and Dom Guéranger also has treated the whole matter with the greatest care and success. On one entirely insignificant question, there is some discrepancy between the defenders of orthodoxy. The "*Civiltà*" writer agrees with F. Bottalla that even the Greek bishops did not condemn Honorius's Letters as Monothelistic: whereas Dom Guéranger and Abbé Chantrel adopt the view which to us has always seemed more probable; viz., that the Eastern bishops did endorse this most unjust charge, and that S. Leo II. implicitly corrected their mistake. Mgr. Dechamps, in his admirable second letter to F. Gratry, places before him both of these views, and adds that any orthodox Catholic can choose between them.

Dom Guéranger has also replied very triumphantly to F. Gratry's allegations concerning the Roman Breviary.

There is another subject, just hinted at by F. Gratry, on which we must say a few words. He comments (p. 66) on what he calls the "shameless assertions" of "certain English Catholics," that "the system of Copernicus and Galileo was false in the seventeenth century but is true and orthodox in the nineteenth, for no other reason than because the Church now authorizes it." The author of these "shameless assertions" is, it seems, the Editor of the *DUBLIN REVIEW*; and we must charge F. Gratry with the offence—we will not say of making "shameless assertions"—but at all events of bringing forward a calumnious and totally unfounded charge, on what he must have well known to be ridiculously insufficient evidence. We find from the "*Revue Catholique*" of February, not only that F. Gratry has never read a word of what we had written, but that even M. Martin himself, from whom F. Gratry borrows all that part of his statement which he has not himself invented,—that M. Martin, we say, also confesses to speaking merely from hearsay. It is on no better grounds than these, that F. Gratry thinks it legitimate to accuse his fellow-Catholics of "shameless assertions." M. Martin, who has never seen what we have written, ventures to put forth a report of it which happens to be entirely mistaken; and then F. Gratry, on his own hook, distorts M. Martin's report into what we must be allowed to call a preposterous travestie.*

What we have said on the Galileo case is, that we heartily concur with the ground taken up by Bellarmine and by Galileo's other theological opponents. It is a very serious thing indeed to interpret Scripture con-

* We observe a letter from Abbé Morel in the "*Univers*" of February 16th, stating that M. Martin's statement of our view is importantly different from F. Gratry's.

trariwise to its one obvious and its one traditional sense : and nothing can justify a Christian in doing so, except some decisive scientific demonstration. But in Galileo's time Heliocentrism, even on strictly scientific grounds, was not one whit a more probable theory than its rival : consequently the Roman Congregations did excellent service to orthodoxy by adopting the course they did. M. Martin, it seems, thinks that their decrees discouraged scientific investigation : but they must have done just the contrary. Bellarmine's language was this : "Let Heliocentrism be scientifically *proved*, and there will be no *theological* objection to holding it." How could such language as this discourage scientific investigation ? We must refer however to our article on Galileo (Oct. 1865) for a detailed answer to the objection.

Undoubtedly, as Dom Guéranger observes, no Pope ever condemned Copernicanism *ex cathedrâ*. Yet Paul V. did in some sense condemn it. On Feb. 28th 1666, Galileo was solemnly warned, "in the name of our Holy Father the Pope," to abandon the Heliocentric tenet. See "*Revue des Questions historiques*," livraison 5, p. 98, note 2. Certainly we think we did some service to the Papal cause, when we showed how simply reasonable was Paul V.'s intervention ; nay, how urgently it was called for in the interest of orthodox doctrine.

However, if F. Gratry will do us the common justice of reading our article, and if he will then do us the honour of commenting on its arguments, we promise him that we will meet his comment point by point without flinching or reserve.

Before concluding, we must revert once more to the Honorius question ; because an important contribution to the controversy has appeared, since we sent our notice to press. F. Colombier, S. J., has now published four out of five papers in the "*Etudes*," and the fourth enters on new ground of some importance. On the whole doctrinal aspect of the case, F. Colombier takes exactly the view which to us also appears the most probable. He holds with great confidence, that the Greek bishops did condemn Honorius's letters as heretical ; and adds, of course, that such condemnation was monstrously unjust. But he considers that S. Agatho died a year earlier than is commonly supposed ; that the news of his death had reached Constantinople before any condemnation of Honorius was attempted ; and that in this way some explanation is given of the gross injustice with which that Pontiff was treated (pp. 390, 391), in his being condemned off-hand without argument or judicial investigation. Our immediate impression, we confess, is adverse to F. Colombier's historical view : but we speak with extreme diffidence, and recommend our readers to study carefully his masterly and most learned disquisition.

The "*Revue Catholique*," in its March number (p. 353), quotes with warm approval Dom Guéranger's statement, that the declarations of the Sixth Council "can have no œcumenical character, except in virtue of the Papal confirmation, and only in the sense and within the limits of that confirmation."

Seconde Lettre à Mgr. Dechamps. Par A. GRATRY.

Troisième Lettre à Mgr. Dechamps. Par A. GRATRY. Paris: Douniol.

F. GRATRY'S second and third letters are in every respect worthy of his first. We will not however here enter on their argument; because it will be far more convenient to await the appearance of F. Bottalla's long-expected work on infallibility. For the present therefore we will content ourselves with submitting a somewhat obvious dilemma to the consideration of F. Gratry and his admirers.

All Gallicans consider that no definition can be truly accounted infallible, which is not confirmed by a preponderating majority of the Episcopate. We will begin then with putting this question to F. Gratry. Does he or does he not hold, that by God's promise a preponderating majority of the Episcopate will always confirm every Pontifical definition? If he replies in the affirmative, then even on his own view he must admit that such definition is infallibly true so soon as it is issued; because God has revealed that it will in due time receive episcopal assent. We must infer therefore that, according to F. Gratry, God has made no promise of the kind.

Such an event therefore as the following may, according to F. Gratry, happen at any time. On some emergent question the Pope may define on one side, and the preponderating majority of the Episcopate on another. Under such circumstances we ask F. Gratry—is there or is there not an infallible definition? According to the answer which he gives it would follow, either (1) that in certain grave cases the Church's power of deciding infallibly may be altogether suspended; or else (2) that the Pope may be under an obligation of abandoning his own dogmatic definition, in deference to an infallible adverse definition of the Episcopate.

Now F. Gratry professes to build his view on history. We ask him therefore straightforwardly—can he produce, from any corner of history however obscure, either before or after the False Decretals—any sanction whatever for *either* of these two doctrines? Whichever of the two he may claim as his own, he is advocating a theory as utterly unsupported by facts, as would be the theory e. g. that theological infallibility is vested by God in the Lord Mayor of London. But if in very shame he shrinks from *both* these amazing doctrines, then (if he would remain a Catholic) he is obliged by strict logical necessity to take up with the only alternative; viz. the dogma of Pontifical infallibility.

Les Doctrines Romaines sur le Liberalisme. Par le P. H. RAMIÈRE, S.J.
Paris : Lecoffre.

THIS is the work which the Holy Father so graciously recognizes in his Letter to F. Ramière, which we have printed elsewhere. We hope in an early number to treat the whole subject, using F. Ramière's volume as the text for our remarks.

Declaration from the Authorities of Trinity College, Dublin, presented to Mr. Gladstone February 19th, 1870.

IN 1868 these gentlemen presented a petition, in which they proclaimed that their University "had been founded by Queen Elizabeth for the purpose of promoting education based on the Protestant religion; and had faithfully fulfilled the trust imposed on it during three centuries." Not two years have elapsed since this solemn profession; and now they declare that "for the last three-quarters of a century" they have "consistently acted upon the principle of imparting to all in common the same secular education, without offending the religious convictions of any." They think then, it would seem, that "education based on the Protestant religion" cannot "offend the religious convictions of" Catholics.

The real truth is, that they will make any sacrifice rather than that Catholic denominational education should be promoted; because (however unconsciously) in real truth they see with much greater equanimity the advance of latitudinarianism, deism, and atheism, than of Catholic orthodoxy and of loyalty to the Holy See.

Catholic Ireland is a conquered country. If the conquerors still intend to govern her on the principle of antipathy to her national creed, let them openly say so.

An Essay in aid of a Grammar of Assent. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D.,
of the Oratory. London: Burns, Oates, & Co.

IT will be admitted by all Father Newman's readers, that this is the *hardest* work he has ever written. Hitherto it has been his habit to diversify his treatment of a grave subject by rhetorical and descriptive episodes, which recreate and charm the reader and give him fresh spirit for abstract thought; but in the present work he seems so sensibly influenced by the gravity of the

task which he has undertaken, as to be incapable of digression. Then, again, he is proceeding for the most part on ground, which has hitherto been almost untrodden, and on which he does but profess to furnish "aids" towards the formation of "a grammar." And the consequence of all this is, that, notwithstanding the profusion of his exquisite illustrations, and notwithstanding his marvellous command of the English language—which he always indeed moulds to his purpose as though it had been invented for the very end of expressing his thoughts—the present Essay is very hard reading.

It must not however be understood that the doctrines of this volume are in any strict sense new. Take e.g. what will probably be admitted to be the central proposition of all; viz., that a vast quantity of most momentous truth is obtainable with certitude, by reasoning which is utterly incapable of logical analysis. This proposition has always been implicitly held by Catholic theologians and philosophers: for not only (as F. Newman points out) they universally assign the "*judicium prudentum*" as the sole means of determining many important verities; but, in treating of moral certainty, they all lay down that a converging series of probabilities may establish a truth quite conclusively and irrefragably. But then at this point they somewhat take us by surprise. For (1), having stated so very pregnant and pervasive a principle, they leave it without any methodical treatment; and do not attempt to give protection against the imminent danger of mistaking mere prejudice for legitimate conviction. And (2) they not unfrequently elsewhere imply—what it is difficult to reconcile with their language about moral certainty—that all conclusive reasoning can be exhibited in logical and syllogistic form.

We think then that F. Newman would have rendered very important service, had he done no more than drawn prominent attention to this noteworthy lacuna. But in fact he has treated the whole subject thus opened out, in a manner which impresses us as being at once strikingly original and at the same time in profound harmony with known truths and facts. No doubt, in several particulars he has contented himself with opening a new vein of thought, without by any means attempting to exhaust it: he has suggested many a principle, which he has left to others to exhibit in its full issue. But this was simply inevitable in so original a work.

On the other hand there are one or two matters on which we cannot assent to F. Newman's view. For one instance of what we mean, we think that he very seriously underrates the importance of logical analysis, as compelling men into consistency with themselves and with acknowledged facts; and as an invaluable protection against prejudice and intellectual self-will.

In the case of a work so boiling over with thought, it is impossible to give the least notion of its contents within the limits of a notice. We hope however, we may have an article ready for our July number, in which we shall be able both duly to exhibit F. Newman's line of thought, and also to express our general appreciation of its characteristics and merits.

The Visible Unity of the Catholic Church maintained against opposite Theories, with an explanation of certain passages in Ecclesiastical History erroneously appealed to in their support. By M. J. RHODES, M.A. In 2 vols. London: Longmans. 1870.

THIS is a work upon an especial controversy of the day ; but in so saying we by no means intend to imply that it is of passing interest. The greatest works upon which all generations have fed with delight have usually been occasioned by some passing controversy. Even the golden work of St. Austin, "The City of God," was written in answer to the taunt of the heathens of his day, that Rome had led the world in triumph up the steep of the Capitol as long as she retained the worship of her ancient gods ; but that as soon as she had devoted herself to the worship of the Crucified, she had herself become the triumph and sport of barbarian conquerors. Great works thus produced by passing controversies lie scattered over the pages of history, one here and one there, as the mighty masses of granite, the records of a glacial ocean which has long passed away, on the now dry and sandy plains of Northern Germany. It is but natural and reasonable, therefore, to hope that some permanent possession may be wrought out for the Church even by the strange and paradoxical arguments of our modern Ritualists. Their claim is quite different from that of other Protestants, especially in times gone by ; who boasted that they belonged not to any visible Church but to one invisible and spiritual, of which all good men were members, however divided the sects of which in this life they might be members. The Ritualists of our day assert, as strongly as Catholics themselves, the visible unity of the Church and the absolute necessity of being members of that one visible community ; and yet they maintain that this one visible Church is made up of three branches : the Catholic Church, which they called the Roman branch ; the Greek Schism ; and the Anglican Establishment.

It is to dispel this strange dream that our author's argument is directed. It is divided into three parts. In the first he lays down what has always been held by Catholics as to the unity of the Church ; and then shows how it is at this day and at all times fulfilled in the one Catholic Church, and in no other community. In the second he examines the theory that unity may really exist between divided and discordant communions. In this part he especially considers and answers the arguments of Dr. Pusey in the "Eirenicon," and of Dr. Forbes, the bishop of the Protestant Episcopalian communion at Brechin, in Scotland, in his book on the Creed ; showing from history that the claim to be the whole Church, in spite of the existence of numerous bodies external to its pale (a claim which Dr. Forbes denounces as Donatist), has always been the special characteristic of the Catholic Church ; and also, that so far as it is any objection to that claim that there exist large and numerous bodies separate from the one Church, and yet possessing

more or less the notes of sanctity, that objection applied quite as strongly at remote times as it does in our own day. It is true, that separatists in our days are quite ready to admit that Donatists, Nestorians, Jacobites, and Arians of old were heretics or schismatics, and that the Church in communion with the See of S. Peter was then the only Catholic Church. In fact, it now seems, at first sight, rather difficult to imagine that they can ever have afforded to doubtful men any excuse for doubting the visible unity of the Church. But this is only because, like other works of men, they have had their day, and have passed away. To those who saw them in their hour of triumph it must have seemed even more difficult to believe that they had no part or lot in the promises given to the one Church, than it can now appear with regard to the Greek or Anglican schism. Next, he shows how, at all times, the note of sanctity has remained impressed upon the one Church; proving especially how clearly it was visible even in those very ages which seem, at a cursory glance, the darkest of all—for instance, the ninth and tenth.

. Next, the author applies the tests of Holy Scripture to the theory that a lessening of the degree of external unity in the Church has been allowed in punishment to the sins of its members; and shows that the nature of the promises, and the object for which they were given, are wholly inconsistent with any such notion. Moreover, that it is wholly irreconcilable with numerous precepts of the Gospel, which would be utterly unmeaning if the visible unity and authority of the Church were liable to be thus suspended by human sin and infirmity.

Then he shows that the theory assumes (what indeed Dr. Forbes strongly asserts) that Rome and Anglicans are still one in Faith; whereas he proves (it is marvellous that anything so self-evident should need to be proved) that they are openly at variance, not only on certain articles of the Faith, but also on the actual foundation of the Faith: as to the ground on which men are to accept the Scriptures and the Creeds, and the whole of the Divine Revelation, the whole of Christianity. For Roman Catholics accept it on the ever-living, ever-present testimony of the Church of God, of that Church whose infallibility Anglicans assert to be suspended.

Then, as to the separate articles of the Faith, Dr. Forbes says, "We bear separate witness to the one Faith which Christ gave to His Church, the Faith of the Creeds." Our author shows the positive contradictions existing between the Catholic Church and Anglicans as to obedience to the Vicar of Christ; as to the Sacraments—Baptism, Confirmation, the Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, Matrimony—each of which he considers separately; the Immaculate Conception. Well, then, as there is a distinct contradiction upon all these points, the question recurs, Which of the two is in the right? Both certainly cannot be; and this seems to be admitted in fact both by Dr. Pusey and Dr. Forbes, whose words our author quotes. He sums up:—

"The theory which we have been discussing asserts the possibility of unity between Christian Churches without visible intercommunion, and maintains that religious bodies may be united to the Church through Christ alone, although visibly disunited from the Vicar of Christ on earth. Thus it reverses

the doctrine of the great S. Thomas, who says—The unity of the Church consists in two things : namely, in the mutual connection of the members of the Church with one another, or communication ; and, again, in the order of all the members of the Church towards one Head, according to what is said (Col. ii.), ‘Puffed up by the sense of his flesh, and not holding the Head from which the whole body, by joints and bands, being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth into the increase of God.’ But this Head is Christ Himself, whose Vicar in the Church is the Supreme Pontiff. And therefore they are pronounced to be schismatics who refuse to be under the Supreme Pontiff, and will not join the communion of the members of the Church, who are subject to Him.”

Our author might now be thought to have come to the end of his subject : having shown first, in his first section, what the true view of the unity of the Church is ; and having considered in the second the claim of bodies out of visible communion with it, to form a part of the same whole. But in answer to this, Anglicans argue that history proves that there have at different periods of the Church been several breaches of visible unity between bodies both of which are now admitted to have been all along parts of the one true and visible Church. This, of course, if the facts were stated correctly, would be a very strong argument against the Catholic doctrine. It would prove that whatever the rules of the Church might require, its practice had been to admit that bodies like the Anglicans, or again, like the Russian schismatics, were really all along portions of the one Church. The author therefore devotes the chief part of his work to an examination of these supposed instances. And first, Dr. Pusey instances the disputes in the Corinthian Church. These, the author replies, did not imply any breach of communion with the universal Church ; and, moreover, they were referred to Rome, and that although the beloved Apostle S. John was still on earth.

Next, Dr. Pusey says, “In the next century was that first wide breach in the Catholic body when the Bishop of Rome, against the remonstrance of many bishops, renounced the communion of the Asiatic churches because they followed, as to the keeping of Easter, a tradition different from that of Rome and of the other Churches.” This case Mr. Rhodes examines in detail. Dr. Pusey has a great advantage in that the facts are very indistinctly known. What appears clearly is :—

“The recorded fact of a Roman Pontiff of the second century sending out letters to Asia Minor, and as it would appear, to other Churches also, to convoke councils on the question of the time of Easter, which councils were accordingly assembled, even among those who varied from the Roman practice on the point to be debated, and the reply of the same dissentient bishops was duly returned to the Holy See. Nor does their reply afford the slightest symptom that they considered Rome to have assumed any undue pre-eminence, although it speaks of threats having been used towards them. It defends the disregard of those threats, not by calling in question the authority of the Roman See, but by appealing directly to the authority of God. The appeal was unjustifiable, and betrayed the obstinacy of the Asiatics in their adherence to private opinion ; but it would have had no meaning unless addressed to a superior.

“Neither do the Bishops, who agreed with S. Victor but deprecated extreme measures, seem to have expressed any doubt of the legitimate power

of the Pope to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches. Speaking in the name of himself and the Bishops of Gaul, the great S. Irenæus tacitly acknowledges this power and authority as belonging to the See of Rome, by the very fact of his urging S. Victor from the exercise of it on this occasion" (219, vol. i.).

The author then quotes authorities from ancient writers, some of them very near the time of S. Victor, to prove that there was no breach of communion, and that the Asiatic Churches continued all along in the same visible body with the rest of the Church. Thus the real result of this case is, that nothing certain can be inferred from it, because the facts are indistinctly known; but that beyond all question, whatever they were, they gave no support to the Anglican position. For as things now stand, if Pius IX. should order the Anglican Bishops to hold a council, and rectify the practice of the Anglican communion by restoring that which obtains elsewhere, the answer would be a denial of his authority. Now this is the one thing which we actually know never took place. The fact is, then, that, as far as the facts are distinctly known, they are against the Anglican position; as far as they have ever been thought to support it, it is because they are, at best, very doubtful. We need hardly say that the *onus probandi* lies wholly upon those who allege them in order to prove that a state of things contrary to the uniform practice of the Church existed in this instance. Before that can be shown, we must of course be certain what the facts really were.

The next case examined is that of Pope S. Stephen on the one side, and S. Cyprian and Firmilian on the other. In this case also the facts are much disputed; but what is not disputed is, that Rome assumed a tone of high authority, and that that authority was not denied even by those least willing to submit to its judgment in the particular case. We must refer our readers to Mr. Rhodes, vol. i., page 225 to 243.

The next case alleged occupies more space, chiefly because more materials exist for forming a judgment upon it. It is well known that the troubles caused by the Arian heresy led to a dispute at Antioch during the latter half of the fourth century. Meletius, one of the most eminent men of these times, had been brought up among the Arians, and was believed to belong to their party. He had, in all probability, been gradually receding from them; but this had not been manifested by any public act, and when they were doing their utmost to force Arians, or at least Arianizers, into all important sees, he was chosen by their votes Bishop of Antioch. It seems that some Catholics had already so far acquired confidence in him as to concur in his election, but by the great mass of Catholics he was rejected and denounced. These were called "Eustathians," from the name of the Catholic bishop who had been forcibly deprived some years before, and whom they continued to acknowledge while he lived.

An occasion soon occurred, however, which threw all party relations into confusion. The Emperor had requested some leading preachers to speak to the people upon a controverted text. Those who preceded Meletius had given an Arian explanation, and he was expected to do the same. He arose, and made an unequivocally Catholic confession. Sozomen says that on this the archdeacon rushed up to him in a rage, and stopped his mouth; but Meletius, holding up to the people first three fingers, and then one alone

proclaimed the same creed more clearly still. The archdeacon seized his hand, and his lips being thus unclosed, he proclaimed the Catholic Faith more strongly than before, loudly exhorting his hearers to maintain steadfastly the Faith of Nicæa, and protesting that all who were otherwise minded erred concerning the truth. This scene was followed by a bitter strife. He was exiled, and his place filled by an Arian; he was restored, and again exiled; a second time restored, and a third time exiled. Having thus been a steadfast confessor for the Faith, it was nowise wonderful that many Catholics acknowledged him. Unfortunately, however, a Catholic bishop had been appointed and consecrated, and him alone the mass of the Catholics in Antioch acknowledged. Hence arose confusion: for some Catholic bishops regarded one, some regarded the other, as the Catholic bishop of Antioch. The dispute lasted long, and must have done much mischief. It is commonly said that at last it was agreed that the two should govern jointly during their lives, the survivor succeeding to the whole authority. Mr. Rhodes thinks the evidence that such a bargain was made insufficient.

It is upon this history that Dr. Pusey and Dr. Forbes chiefly rest their defence of the Anglican position. They argue that Meletius was out of communion with Rome; but that, notwithstanding this, he presided at the second General Council, and has always been admitted to be a saint. Mr. Rhodes gives a very clear and full narrative of the proceedings (vol. i. p. 243-341), and we think fully establishes his point that Meletius, so far as appears, was never out of Roman communion, although he was not acknowledged by Rome as Bishop of Antioch. But it is also clear that at least some time before the second General Council he was formally recognized by Rome, even in this last capacity. We must refer to Mr. Rhodes's narrative for the particulars. All that this case really proves is the importance of the minute regulations introduced by the Holy See in after-times, and which Anglicans refer to as "usurpations," by which special care is taken that there shall never be any doubt who really is the Catholic Bishop of every see in Christendom. Had those regulations existed in the time of Meletius, the dispute could never have arisen. As it was, there was as little resemblance as possible to the Anglican position. No Anglican Bishop for three hundred years has ever been recognized either as a Catholic, or even as a schismatical Bishop, by any Pope or by any Bishops or people in communion with the See of Rome; or even by any schismatical body, except those consisting of members of the Anglican schism who, by some accident, have settled in other lands (as e.g. the United States). At Antioch there was unhappily an internal schism, during which two parties, although each acknowledging the chief of the other to be a Bishop, denied that he was the rightful Bishop of Antioch. There were times when one was accepted as the Catholic Bishop by some Catholic Bishops in other parts, and the other by others. But there was no time when either of the two was wholly separated from the rest of the Church. What the appeal made by Dr. Pusey and Dr. Forbes to this case really proves is, how hopeless it must be to obtain any tolerably early colour for the support of Anglicanism, when this is really the chief fact which they can cite in their favour.

Our limits oblige us to pass more rapidly over the last case appealed to by

Dr. Forbes, that of the Celtic churches in the British islands. It is, however, of especial interest to us as Englishmen ; and it has been more frequently appealed to than any other, as proving that societies out of communion with the Apostolic See may yet be Catholic. Mr. Rhodes examines the question at length in his second volume, and to this we must refer our readers. The subject itself is most interesting ; and it is discussed so fully and clearly, and in a manner so interesting that we think few persons will begin without finishing it. No reasonable man who has followed the case through this volume can doubt that the ancient British churches were distinctly and emphatically what is called by Protestants Papist ; although he will see, as in the last case, that inconveniences formerly arose from the want of rules of discipline which have now been happily established.

What makes Mr. Rhodes's book specially valuable is, that while thoroughly Catholic in tone and doctrine, it is written in a spirit so friendly and full of consideration and charity for those still in the darkness of Protestantism, that it is hard to think any one could take offence at it. On this account it is singularly suited to be put in the hands of inquiring Protestants.

It has also another great recommendation. The very circumstance of its being written by a layman has led to its being examined so carefully, and approved by persons so highly competent, that it is probably long since any work has been published among us with such high authority. Besides the "Nihil obstat" of a theologian appointed by the Archbishop of Westminster, it has been read and approved by the Bishop of Cork, in whose diocese the author till of late resided, and by "two professors of theology belonging respectively to two of the highest ecclesiastical colleges in Rome." Of these one was Padre Cardella, who has allowed use to be made of his name. The author remarks that Dr. Pusey has more than once asked for an explanation of the teaching of the Church on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction ; and that given in vol. i. has "undergone the strictest scrutiny."

The Evidence for the Papacy, as derived from the Holy Scriptures and from Primitive Antiquity. With an Introductory Epistle. By the Hon. COLIN LINDSAY. London : Longmans. 1870.

MR. LINDSAY is a convert of recent standing. Much, if not most, of the materials of this work must therefore, we should suppose, have been put together while he was yet outside the body of the Church. Yet, for depth and accuracy, both of learning and argument, it would reflect no little credit on an old and practised Catholic polemic. We do not quite go with the author in each and every minute detail of exposition and reasoning : but the solid mass of "Evidence for the Papacy" which he has constructed, especially from the early Fathers and Councils, is absolutely impregnable.

The author divides his work into two *Inquiries*,—the first on S. Peter's Supremacy, the second on the Papal or Roman Supremacy. In the first he

draws his arguments from Scripture and the Consensus Patrum : to these he, in his second Inquiry, adds the testimonies of Councils, Emperors, Papal Acts and Epistles, &c. To each Inquiry, under the title of "*Audi alteram partem*," he subjoins a searching and solid refutation of the leading Protestant arguments, which are chiefly drawn from Barrow's well-known, and we might say, exhaustive treatise.

Mr. Lindsay's manipulation of the Scripture argument is, we feel bound to say, the part of his task which he has executed in the least satisfactory manner : in truth it is the only substantial portion of his work which really *is* unsatisfactory. He merely scratches the surface of the three great texts of Matthew xvi., Luke xxii., and John xxi. ; leaving undug the solid and precious ore that lies imbedded in them. Then, he brings forward some other passages, from which we cannot see how anything like a conclusive argument could be drawn, at least as against a Protestant opponent. Some of his Protestant critics have accordingly not failed to pick out these very passages, and fasten on them as specimens of weak reasoning. We notice these drawbacks solely out of our strong love for the great cause which Mr. Lindsay has undertaken to defend : and we are sure that he has that cause too much at heart, not to take our strictures in the same spirit in which we give them. We may also notice here that he seems not to be aware that the meaning which he gives* to the celebrated text, John v. 39 ("*Search the Scriptures*"; &c.), is so far from being certain, that even Protestant interpreters, many and eminent too,† translate the Greek word (*ipeuvāre*) in the indicative mood—"You search." And Catholic theologians have shown that, even if the word be taken in the imperative mood, it is not only not clear that it is to be understood as conveying a general command or counsel, but that, the usage of Scripture being taken into account, the context would seem pretty strongly to imply the very opposite meaning.

These few defects are, however, fully and amply, and more than amply, redeemed by the magnificent manner in which the great traditional or historic argument is built up so carefully and firmly, stone upon stone, and raised into an edifice of perfect strength and unity. We have in our language some excellent summaries and fragments of this argument ; for example, the series of extracts in Mr. Waterworth's "*Faith of Catholics*," and the glowing sketch in Dr. Newman's "*Essay on Development*." But we had no *treatise* on the subject either complete or scientific ; and here is a convert but of yesterday, who has perfectly supplied our want, by giving us a treatise at once both complete and scientific. He has executed a task, which not many of our professed theologians have even attempted—and which indeed could not well be executed, at least so fully, except in a monograph like the present. He gives his collection of Patristic and Conciliar testimonies—to say nothing of other testimonies given at the end of the volume. To each extract he subjoins a copious commentary, in which the meaning of the text is admirably illustrated and enforced. This method, besides imparting to the discussion a peculiar freshness, stamps it also with a peculiar value. For to get a clear

* Introductory Epistle, p. xxix.

† Kuinoel, Rosenmüller, Schleusner, Olshausen, Bloomfield, &c.

and full view of the drift of some of these ancient writings explanatory notes are often just as necessary as they are for the historical and other less difficult parts of the Bible. Thus, for example, the celebrated 28th canon of the Council of Chalcedon would seem, at first sight and viewed by itself, a perfect maze of perplexity to a Catholic student. But, as Mr. Lindsay puts it, viewed in the light of numerous other sayings and doings of the Council from beginning to end, and especially in the light of the synodical epistle to Pope Leo, all difficulty vanishes at once. The canon was passed in the absence of the Papal Legates, and after more than two-thirds of the Fathers had departed for good. Now, the very Bishops who drew up the canon addressed a letter to the Pope, in which there are two very remarkable features. First, they address Leo in terms as submissive and as strongly and distinctly affirming his supremacy, as could be used by the Vatican Council, now sitting, in addressing Pius. They call themselves members, children (*παῖδες*): they call him the head (*κεφαλή, κορυφή*)—the interpreter to all of Peter's voice—to whom the guardianship of the vineyard had been committed by the Saviour. In the second place, they ask him in the language of earnest supplication, and definitely and specially—to do what? To ratify this very 28th canon; that is to say, if the Protestant interpretation were true, to ratify a denial of that very headship! Our author remarks that Anglicans, in quoting the canon against the Roman Supremacy, never refer to this synodical epistle. As we are on this subject, we may notice briefly the marked change in the wording of the canon when speaking of the privileges accorded by the Fathers to Rome and to Constantinople. In speaking of the former, the word used is *ἀποδίδωμι*, which regularly signifies to give what one has a right to, what is due; in speaking of the latter, in the same breath, the term is suddenly changed, and *ἀπονέμω* is used, a word which has never been used in such a sense.

Mr. Lindsay's volume is not one from which to take extracts. We regret this the less, as we have no doubt it will find its way into the library of every one who takes a serious interest in the important subject of which it treats

The Directorium Asceticum; or, Guide to the Spiritual Life. By JOHN BAPTIST SCARAMELLI, S.J. Translated at S. Beuno's College. Vol. I. Dublin: Kelly; London: Burns & Oates. 1870.

THE "Direttorio Ascetico" of F. Scaramelli is a manual of Christian ethics. The science of ethics was one of which the ancient philosophers made much; and it is to be regretted, in some respects, that it is not more attended to at the present day. Undoubtedly, when Aristotle or Seneca wrote on ethical questions, they had greater difficulties to contend with than we can have, because for them, in the absence of Revelation, all but the very fundamental principles of the science were dark and uncertain. Our principles, on the other hand, are clear, fixed, and certain; and therefore it is

not necessary, for practical purposes, to institute any laborious inquiry into the primary laws of good and evil. Yet such an inquiry is useful and healthy, even yet. But there is an opposite extreme which surely is very objectionable, even on practical grounds—that is, to content ourselves with the remote conclusions of Christian morals, or, as we call them, the practical matters, and take the groundwork for granted. Christian morality is a science with a practical end. It directs us to the doing of something. Now, the most unscientific mechanic, when he teaches his apprentice his art, attempts to give a reason here and there. It is obvious why his instinct leads him to do so. It is because a practical “habit,” as it is called, is both sooner acquired, better kept, and more perfectly used, when it is aided and confirmed by a scientific “habit.” In other words, the more the intellect is brought to bear upon any faculty or operation of soul or body, the more of order, completeness, and retentiveness there is, and consequently the greater efficiency. It is true, spiritual writers give reasons for things. But to give reasons is not sufficient to make “science.” The reasons must be orderly, starting from principles; and the treatment must be fairly exhaustive. It is true also that there are peculiar complications in the science of Christian ethics. It is founded as much on authority as on reason, for without revelation it would not exist; and, in the same manner, its deduction and its practice are obtained as much from the sayings of saints and doctors as from reasoning. But a principle can be obtained from a revealing authority quite as fairly, for scientific purposes, as from the pure reason; and the authoritative teachings of the Church and the Saints, if they sometimes go faster than unassisted reason, only do so like the light of a lamp which goes faster than the eye. Again, grace is the most important element in Christian morality; without it, all science is barren. This is true, however, not only of scientific morality, but of the most fervent exhortations and the strongest sermons. But this leads us to one important point, the influence of which has probably had more than anything else to do with preventing morality from taking a scientific shape. In virtue and vice, the heart is of more consequence than the head. No amount of system, definition, deduction, and other scientific apparatus can set in motion one wheel of the moral machine; whilst, on the other hand, a good will somehow or other manages to reach the Last End without knowing, or indeed caring, whether or no it is proceeding on strictly scientific principles. This is the reason why so many spiritual writers choose rather to fill the space at their command with appeals to the will, with warning examples, with pathos, with terror, than to strive for scientific completeness. If we add to all this the consideration that souls are as varied as countenances, that the spiritual writer has not unlimited opportunities, and that this life is short, it becomes pretty clear that there are difficulties in the way of a scientific treatment of how to get to heaven and avoid hell. Still, it seems to be not only possible, but profitable. That there should be some division of labour on so immense a subject is, no doubt, very advisable. It is very good that one writer should deal chiefly with moving appeals to the heart, that another should make much of authority, whilst a third may aim at a more strictly scientific treatment. Those who read the moral treatises of Lewis of Granada, of S. Francis

of Sales, or of the school of M. Olier, cannot but feel they are reading authors who care more for devotion than rule. This is strikingly evident in the formal treatise on Prayer by the Spanish Dominican, and in such a quasi-scientific work as the "*Amour de Dieu*" of S. Francis. These may be called the affective Ascetics. Then there are those who devote themselves to Authorities; writers of *Maxims of the Saints*, "*Fioretti*," Extracts from the Fathers, Spirit of the Saints, &c. Thirdly, there are the more strictly ethical class, who strive very little after affection, though they illustrate and enforce their lessons by frequent appeals to Scripture and the Fathers. The examples of this class are chiefly met with in the Society of Jesus. Jerome Platus, Alphonsus Rodriguez, Lewis Lallement and his school, Drexelius, Nieremberg, and other names, will at once occur to the reader; and among them must be placed Father Scaramelli.

Why the Jesuits took up the "scientific" aspect of asceticism, or Christian morals, it is not difficult to explain. In the first place, it was their vocation to systematize everything, from Prayer down to Latin Grammar. Still, there had been system before the Jesuits. And therefore it is more correct to say that it was their mission to systematize many things afresh, with a view to a fresh age. Now, in the middle ages the "*Summa*" of S. Thomas, and more especially the "*Secunda Pars*" had been a complete and sufficient store-house of ethical science, as indeed it still continues to be. But the days were over when every cleric read the "*Summa*"; and the days were come when not only every cleric, but nearly every layman, wanted something to read instead of it. And so the society presented the world, in various shapes, with the ethical teachings of the "*Summa*" under a more modern aspect. The "*Direttorio Ascetico*," for instance, refers to the great work of S. Thomas on nearly every other page.

The treatise of Scaramelli consists of four parts. The first treats of perfection and the means to acquire it, such as prayer, reading, meditation, the practice of the presence of God, &c. The second goes on to consider the impediments to perfection, which are classed under the heads of the five senses, the Passions, the World, the Devil, &c. In the third part the author speaks of the "proximate dispositions" to perfection—in other words, of the moral virtues, such as temperance, religion, obedience, chastity. As he observes, this third treatise looks as if it were going to be a repetition of the second. But it is not so. To combat a vice is a very different thing from practising the perfection of a virtue. The concluding part is on the three theological virtues, Faith, Hope, and Charity, in the exercise of which, and chiefly of charity, the essential perfection of man consists. Each of the parts or treatises here enumerated is long enough to form a considerable volume, and it is the first part which is now before us in the English version mentioned at the head of this notice.

In one respect this first part of the "*Direttorio Ascetico*" is calculated to give the reader a rather unfavourable idea of the author's method and ability. Take, for instance, his definition of Perfection. This is an all-important point in an ascetical treatise; for if it be missed much confusion is sure to follow, whilst, if it be clearly and convincingly given, the whole of what is to come afterwards will receive light from its clearness and order from its truth.

F. Scaramelli, happily, here follows S. Thomas, according to his custom. But he commences a paragraph in his first article thus: "The holy fathers, when speaking of Christian perfection, do not agree in laying down what its substance is; for some of them seem to place it wholly in one virtue, others in a different one." Now it is surely impossible even to suppose that the holy Fathers can disagree as to what it is that a man ought to aim at in this life in order to save his soul. Their expressions may differ, but the meaning and the substantial teaching must be the same in all. And the really satisfactory way, it seems to us, of laying the foundation of an ascetical system would be to compare and analyze these varying expressions of the Fathers, and, by showing their agreement, explain their different points of view. For instance, charity and union with God are the same thing, except that charity denotes rather the active side; union with God, the state. Again, union of God is the same as purity of heart; for union with God means God alone, purity of heart means no creature. Some of the Fathers speak as if humility were perfection; and so it is, for humility means no self, which is the correlative, or rather the complement of God alone. To start with the idea that there can be any reasonable doubt as to what perfection consists in is to start with an admission that the scientific part of your treatise may be all a mistake, for the nature of the means depends entirely upon the analysis of the ultimate end.

F. Scaramelli, however, starts with the true view, as we have said. Indeed, no one can suppose that he thought any other view possible. But, this being the case, it would perhaps have been better to have said so.

This reserve made, there is little to do but praise. An orderly, calm book like this is a great and permanent boon. We are not badly off now for spiritual reading in English. But most of our spiritual books begin in the middle of things, and leave off there also. This one, on the other hand, lays down the lines of Christian progress from the beginning up to that point where the ordinary ways are superseded by the extraordinary. It is a book that makes one realize the phrase, "Work out your salvation." S. Paul's favourite simile of the athlete of the ancient games is translated in these pages. The Christian is bidden to weigh what perfection is, to look well at it and see if it be not desirable, and the only thing that is desirable. He is told that if he would be perfect he must seek out a master or director. He is introduced to the reading of spiritual books, and advised how to profit by them. He is instructed in the right use of meditation. He is taught how to pray. Then he is brought into the atmosphere of God's "Presence." To purify his heart he is led to the tribunal of penance, and to give him strength he is taken to the Holy table. His eye is taught the difficult art of searching the recesses of his own conscience, that he may know himself. And finally he is recommended to Holy Mary and the Saints.

F. Scaramelli's language is clear, simple, and flowing, with a not unpleasant tendency to diffuseness, such as we find in many eloquent writers and speakers. It is a grateful duty to say that the translation, which we have tested with some severity, is admirable, both with respect to accuracy and to idiom. The copious quotations from the Fathers, a valuable feature in the work, are all translated in the text, whilst the original is given in a foot-note.

The author's examples are no less conspicuous than his citations, and not by any means so praiseworthy. Cæsarius of Heisterbach has a little led him astray here. Still, a lively example is considered by many readers of spiritual books as a pleasing feature, and many of the stories of the old novice-master of the twelfth century are striking enough not to be quickly forgotten. And therefore it is, perhaps, just as well that the editor has let them stand, instead of omitting them. He need not, however, have been so economical of space in some of his references. Most people, for instance, are not much the better for knowing that the author of a fact is "Theod. de Apoll.," or "Joan. Junior. Dominic."

There cannot be two ideas about the value of this work, the first part of which is now offered for the first time in an English translation. No reader need be troubled by noticing that it is ostensibly addressed to confessors. The greater portion of the book is not even formally directed to them ; and the practical admonitions at the end of each chapter, though they are thus addressed, contain little that is not quite as useful to everybody. If any anxious person is afraid that such a "spiritual guide" as this will make penitents as wise as their directors, all we can say is, that the directors must look to that.

Inaugural Address delivered before the "Literary, Historical, and Æsthetical Society of the Catholic University of Ireland." By WILLIAM DILLON, Auditor. Session 1869-70. Dublin : Browne & Nolan.

THIS little pamphlet contains more than it promises,—Mr. Dillon's address, and in addition, an account of the proceedings at the meeting of the Society in which it was delivered. That Society, one of the offshoots of the Catholic University, is intended to practise the students both in thinking and in expressing their thoughts, by weekly meetings, in which papers are read and debates held, in alternate meetings. The address before us is on a subject always interesting to us,—the Men of the Middle Ages.

We may best judge of its merits, as delivered, by the testimony of the eminent men, Protestant as well as Catholic, who heard it. Some of them were evidently hardly able to sympathize with the enthusiasm with which the speaker looked back to the "Ages of Faith." But they felt what was expressed by one of them, Isaac Butt, Q.C. :—"In the noble address they had heard to-night—it was noble because it was thoughtful, and noble because it was the working out of a man's own thought—they had the strongest proof that the very highest control of religion over the intellect did not restrain thought." This is a rather amusing, but really an encouraging specimen of the judgment which able and thoughtful Protestants are likely to form of a Catholic University which vindicates its right to the name. They have been bred up to believe, what Lord Russell wrote (in a letter which, we suspect, he would now very gladly forget) that the Catholic religion cripples the intellect and confines the soul. As they see the working

of the men whom it produces, they will be obliged to admit that this is not exactly the case ; that, at any rate, good Catholics can think, and think with power and originality ; and although, not in the least understanding their first principles, they are likely enough to be puzzled at many of their conclusions, they will be forced to admit that they are conclusions worked out by the free use of vigorous intellects, held with deep and earnest conviction, and that there is in them much that exactly meets the greatest moral and social wants of our own times.

The address itself eloquently and earnestly describes the " Middle Ages " as " showing what Christianity can accomplish when it takes hold of a people in its barbarous infancy, trains it through the struggles of its unruly youth, and at length develops the full dignity and beauty of Christian manhood." He complains that in our days " it is the fashion to look upon success as the end of life. Some say Mammon-worship is the besetting sin of our age ; I think it is the worship of success." The characteristic of the Middle Ages, which he contrasts to this, is the prevalence of faith : and most justly. For wherever men accustom themselves to think that the things seen, not the things unseen, are the great object to be desired, success in one form or other is sure to usurp the place in the heart which ought to be occupied by God alone. He ends:—

" We live in an age of great commercial activity, and in, or, if you will, under, a great commercial nation. Commerce and honour are plants that do not flourish kindly in the same soil. * * Shall we not then occasionally withdraw ourselves from the hard realities around us, and by living for a time in the company of the noble dead, keep alive and sensitive within us that high and keen sense of honour which was their dearest treasure, and should be ours ? That Faith which was the animating principle, the life-giving inspiration of the Middle Ages, we still possess. Ireland, while losing all else, has has ever carefully guarded it, ' though her manuscripts were burned, her men scattered, her churches closed, her monuments of civilization razed ; her Faith, like the lamps of old in the places of death, burned on in the heart of Ireland unwatched and unfed, and now that the free air is admitted, diffuses itself through her frame ; and when she shall stand forth strong and free, it will be the heart of the old isle, animating a frame of greater sinew, proportion, and beauty.' So wrote an illustrious Irishman. Let us, especially in this Irish Catholic University, strive to realize it. It is by cherishing our Faith, by a truer comprehension of its spirit, a fuller insight into its teaching, a deeper and more heartfelt love of its truth and holiness, that we may best hope to become ' simple, earnest, brave, and faithful,' loyal sons of Ireland, and worthy imitators of the great men of the Middle Ages."

The whole address is that of a very young man sincerely captivated with the beauty of the " Ages of Faith." We are glad to see indications (though we wish they were more developed) that the speaker is not a mere " *laudator temporis acti* " ; for we are fully convinced that each age has its own good as well as evil qualities, and are sometimes inclined to doubt whether any, except Him Who knows all things, can justly weigh age against age. An age is so far like an individual, that it has excellences and defects, and these so greatly differ in different ages, as in different men, that from the difference of their nature they hardly admit of comparison. It is a common saying with regard

to men, that the last Day will be the great day of canonization, because then only will it truly appear how many there have been among those by whom we are surrounded, in whom Faith, Hope, and Charity, and the other virtues, have attained to heroic proportions. The difficulty is still greater when we try to compare things so complex as different nations, still more, different ages of the world. Still it is most certain that there are periods in which particular virtues are strong and triumphant, and others in which the same virtues are weak ; and therefore we cannot do amiss when we set before ourselves the example of ages which were strong exactly where our own is most weak. And unquestionably the chief characteristic of our own time is the weakness of Faith, the dimness which clouds and obscures men's eyes when they would gaze upon the world unseen ; while, on the contrary, the best and most striking characteristic of the Middle Ages was that, of all principles of action, the most powerful and the most universally prevalent was faith in things not seen. It is this impression which is left on our mind by reading the address before us ; and if we feel in it a certain want of order and arrangement, and are inclined to doubt why each beautiful picture or narrative comes exactly where it does, this is no more than was to be expected from the work of a very young man, whose soul is kindled by the beauty of past times ; and the most severe criticism which any one could make upon it is that, it in some respects reminds us of the characteristic defects of one of the most beautiful works of our own times,—the “*Mores Catholici*” of Mr. Kenelm Digby.

The Origin, Persecutions, and Doctrines of the Waldenses, from Documents, many now for the first time collected and edited. By PIUS MELLA, D.D.
London : Toovey. 1870.

THE “Daily Telegraph” is rather an amusing sort of paper, and never more so, to our thinking, than when it becomes oracular on questions of theology or Church history. “Is Saul among the prophets ?” we cannot help asking. How is it that the great authority on such subjects as balls at the Tuileries, races at Baden, and the betting-ring generally, has become enlightened and enlightening on religious questions ? Our faith is a little shaken by being told, for instance, as we were some time ago, that Thaddeus is a Slavonic name. Not that we know anything of Slavonic (in which language the “Daily Telegraph” is, no doubt, profoundly versed), but we have an impression that one of the Apostles was called Thaddeus, and we have never heard any argument to prove that he was a Slavonian. The “Daily Telegraph” was in one of its dogmatic moods on the 30th of April, 1868. It was telling that ignorant world which it is its sacred mission to instruct all about the Waldenses. “For sixteen hundred years, at least,” said the “Daily Telegraph,” “the Waldenses have guarded the pure and primitive Christianity of the Apostles. . . . No one knows when or how the faith was first delivered to these mountaineers. . . . Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons in the second

century found them a church. . . . These gallant hill-men have kept the tradition of the Gospel committed to them, as pure and inviolate as the snow upon their own Alps. . . . No bloodier cruelty disgraces the records of the Papacy than the persecutions endured by the ancestors of the twenty thousand Waldenses now surviving," &c. &c. &c.

This article happened to come under the notice of a learned Italian ecclesiastic, resident in London, who read it with astonishment. He thought he knew something about the Waldenses, but what he knew was very different from what was told him here. If he had heard of the Sclavonian Thaddeus, he might have put down their "pure and primitive Christianity" to the credit of that apocryphal Apostle; but he knew very well that the sect was very far short of sixteen hundred years old. He knew very well that there were no such people in Lyons in the second century, or for ten centuries after. Perhaps he did not know that John Milton had written a sonnet about the alleged persecution of the Waldenses of Piedmont in his time, calling on the Lord to avenge His "slaughtered saints," and denouncing the "triple tyrant" and the "Babylonian woe." But with regard to this assumed blot on the "records of the Papacy," Dr. Melia had a knowledge of historical facts probably unknown to Milton, and presumably unknown (if we may dare to say so) to the "Daily Telegraph" itself. The occasion seemed to him to call for an authoritative refutation of such statements, and accordingly he has since devoted himself with most commendable diligence to exploring all the original documents connected with the subject. The result of his researches is comprised in the volume before us; and we will now state briefly what it is that he seems to have established satisfactorily.

It is proved from unquestionable evidence that the Waldenses had their origin at Lyons, in or about the year 1170. They were called after Peter of Vaud* (*Valdum*), a merchant of Lyons, who, being moved by the sudden death of one of his friends to distribute his wealth amongst the poor, gathered numbers of that class around him, and began to expound the Gospel to them. A religious movement, somewhat resembling Methodism, was the issue of his proceedings, but the unauthorized missionaries whom it called into action were speedily inhibited by ecclesiastical authority, and, disregarding it, were excommunicated. At the outset, there was nothing heterodox in their tenets; but as it is the inevitable tendency of schism to grow into heresy, and of heresy to become more heretical, what has happened in all similar cases happened in theirs also. It is worthy of remark, however, that even up to the early part of the sixteenth century they retained most articles of the Catholic faith. They admitted all the books of the Bible as received by the Catholic Church; they did not deny the doctrine of the Real Presence; they honoured (though they did not invoke) our Blessed Lady and the Saints; they even approved of Religious Celibacy, Auricular Confession, Vows of Poverty, and other distinctive Catholic practices. With their previous predisposition to the infection, they did not escape the influence of the heresies of the sixteenth century. They oscillated between Lutheranism

* A village near Lyons.

and Calvinism in matters of dogma, and in their ecclesiastical constitution differed from both.

With respect to the so-called Waldenses of Piedmont, there is good reason for supposing that they were not connected by any link at all of descent or constant tradition with the original sect of the name, and that their adoption of it was the idea of one of their pastors, the notorious John Leger. Just as amongst us some plebeian Muggins assumes the name of De Mogyns, on the strength of which he expects to be taken for the descendant of some one who "came over with the Conqueror," so those nameless sectaries of the subalpine valleys suddenly sprang into consideration as the legitimate representatives of a body with which in reality they had little or nothing in common. The persevering mendacity of Leger has not been without lasting results. Supported as it was by an ingenious system of forgery and fraud, it has succeeded in impressing the superficial Protestant mind with the notion that his Waldenses are the great living evidence of that indefectibility which Protestantism is compelled to claim, without being able to adduce any title of the least validity. Dr. Melia shows very clearly that the accounts of the Waldenses current among English Protestants rest, *en dernière analyse*, on Leger's authority. He shows that the original documents upon which Leger professed to found his statements were discovered, by such unsuspected critics as the late Dr. Todd, of Trinity College, Dublin, not to possess in themselves the antiquity claimed for them, and to have been, as quoted by Leger, corrupted and falsified. Respecting that slaughter of the "Saints," in 1635, which excited the Puritanical pity of Milton, the facts are accurately, though briefly, given in Lingard's "History of England." Dr. Melia verifies them carefully in detail by reference to authentic documents. In the first place, the "triple tyrant" had no more to do with it than he had with "Paradise Lost." Secondly, it was simply a case of revolt against the Duke of Savoy's authority, which he was perfectly justified in putting down. Finally, the Duke's minister, the Marquis Pianezze, took no measures in suppressing it but such as the obstinate resistance of the insurgents called for. It is curious and somewhat amusing to note a lie of that day, probably originating with a prototype of that class of intellectual creatures known as "our own correspondents" in ours. The worst atrocities ascribed to Pianezze's army were said to have been perpetrated by a regiment of "Irish Papists," commanded by Prince Thomas of Savoy. It turned out on inquiry that the "Irish" Papists were Englishmen, commanded by the Earl of Bristol, and that nothing particularly bad could be laid to their charge.

This work testifies most creditably to the diligence, patience, honesty of judgment, and critical discrimination of its author. It is not produced in such a form as to become a part of our popular literature, but, as an accumulation of testimony, it is really exhaustive of the subject. Those who prefer to study history in original documents will find in it everything that can throw light upon the points at issue. If any Catholic writer is disposed (and it would be a useful thing) to prepare a volume on the subject for popular reading, he will find here all the materials ready to his hand. We are bound to say, also, that the ease and correctness with which Dr. Melia writes our language render his apologies for any shortcomings in the matter of composition almost wholly unnecessary.

Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel, sein Leben, seine Schriften und das griechische Schisma, nach handschriftlichen und gedruckten Quellen. Von Dr. J. HERGENRÖTHER, o. ö. Professor des Kirchenrechts und der Kirchengeschichte an der Universität Würzburg. Dritter Band. Regensburg. 1869.

Monumenta Græca ad Photium ejusque Historiam pertinentia. Collegit ediditque J. HERGENRÖTHER. Ratisbonæ. 1869.

WITH this third volume Dr. Hergenröther has brought to a close his Life of Photius, which it is not too much to say must henceforth be considered the classical work on the history of the Greek schism.

The two former volumes, noticed in our number for April, 1868, brought down the history to the death of Photius. The third volume, extending to the great length of 887 large-sized octavo pages, is divided into three books, forming the eighth, ninth, and tenth of the whole work.

The eighth book (pp. 1-260) consists of an historical and critical account, with an analysis of the works of Photius. The mere enumeration of the chapters gives us a high idea of the varied learning and gifts, so grievously misused, of this singular man. The chapters of this book are headed as follows:—1. The Lexicon, or Glossary. 2. The Myriobiblion (better known under the title of the "Bibliotheca"). 3. The Amphilochia (various treatises on biblical and dogmatical questions addressed to Amphilochius, Archbishop of Cyzicus). 4. Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments. 5. Works on the Canons. 6. Controversial works, historical and dogmatical. 7. Letters. 8. Sermons. 9. Poems. 10. Collection of moral sentences or proverbs. 11. Spurious and doubtful works. 12. Lost works.

Of the value of these works and the learning of the unhappy patriarch, the author expresses a high appreciation, though naturally with somewhat less enthusiasm than Greek schismatic writers, or Protestant critics, in whose eyes Photius has the grand merit of having inflicted the most grievous and lasting injury upon the Church. "The study of his works, says Dr. Hergenröther, "almost tempts the reader to doubt the identity of the Photius who speaks in them with the Photius of history" (p. 2). "Catholic as well as non-Catholic critics down to the present day have ever formed the most favourable judgment as to his learning and the value of his works; and if they have felt compelled to condemn him in a moral point of view, have only adjudged him a still higher place in the ranks of literature" (p. 4). "The extraordinary mansidedness of his mind and of his learning, quite unusual in his day, must ever impress the student of his works. Few men, throughout the whole of the Middle Ages shone in so many departments of knowledge; and if, after the manner of his time, he was more of a compiler than of an original and creative author, he has given proof, even as a compiler, of independent judgment, whilst he has shown

himself in other writings to be also a creative and fruitful thinker" (p. 5). "None can deny to Photius the praise of a marvellously elastic and versatile genius, a rare fund of reading, and the painstaking industry and store of varied knowledge which mark the man of many sciences. His style, however, is in general very different from that of the ancients, and there is much in it that is artificial and affected. Even apart from the language, we cannot set an equally high value, from a scientific point of view, on all his works. In some he is only a skilful compiler, in others an independent inquirer. Sometimes he gives as his own the labours of others, without a hint of the true author; sometimes he fills them out with greater or less additions of his own; whence it follows that the style is not always the same. He never raised himself above many of the prejudices of his time, and if in a certain sense he represents its whole learning, he represents it with all its weak points" (p. 7). We have thought it worth while to show thus fully Dr. Hergenröther's estimate of Photius as a writer, because it is a good specimen of the impartial and moderate spirit in which he has treated a question which has been the subject of such embittered controversy for centuries.

The ninth book (pp. 260—652) is devoted to a careful examination of the theological teaching of Photius. These 400 pages are a monument of that painstaking research and accurate mastery of detail which are such honourable characteristics of German history and criticism. Whilst pointing out important defects and errors in the theology of Photius, our author forms a high opinion of it on the whole. "His theology is not free," he says, "from partial views, gaps, and inconsistencies, from obscurities and subtilities; nevertheless it is marked by fulness and elevation, and has many positive merits; amongst which must be reckoned especially its profound biblical and patristic studies, the employment of the aid of profane learning, and its effort after logical development. A rigorous adhesion to the Peripatetic philosophy, a complete unacquaintance with the rich treasures of the school of Augustine, a dislike for all Platonic elements, some of which, however, found their way into it through the highly-valued works of the Pseudo-Areopagite, make his theology at times dry, meagre, and defective; and owing to his complete rejection of Origen and horror of Origenism, many important theological teachings of earlier times are either entirely wanting or have found no worthy place in his writings. Again, his doctrine of the Holy Trinity is unsatisfactory, and in various ways distorted in the service of a passionate controversy. The slight importance attached to the doctrine of Perichoresis, the tracing of the unity of essence to the common origin from the Father of the Son and Holy Ghost, who are regarded as altogether collateral, the illustration of the balance so often used afterwards, are injurious to all deeper explanation of the mystery." Nevertheless he adds, "Without leaving us a complete dogmatic system, Photius shows himself in the treatment of individual dogmas an able theologian, a schoolman in the full sense of the word, and one of the most influential representatives of Greek scholasticism, which developed itself long before that of the West, though soon outstripped by it" (p. 651).

The tenth book (pp. 653-887) traces the history of the Eastern Church from the death of Photius to the final consummation of the schism. The author shows that, though the evil work of Photius was repaired for a time, yet during the two centuries of uneasy and precarious union which followed the Eighth Council, the seeds which he had sown grew up and spread in the congenial soil of the East. And when the final outbreak came under the patriarchate of Michael Cærularius, it was the works of Photius which furnished the topics, and even, to a great extent, the very words of accusation, recrimination, and argument against the Latins. Above all, it was Photius who supplied the schism with its dogmatic basis' "He it was who first stigmatized the Latins as heretics. His doctrine on the Holy Ghost was silently spread during the tenth century. Later on, his *Controversial Encyclical* was furbished up for use by Michael Cærularius, and reinforced with a fresh stock of charges. The controversialists of the twelfth century made even greater use of his writings" (p. 876); and finally he himself received from his followers in the cultus of sanctity the strongest testimony to his primary influence in the origin and perpetuation of the schism.

Our author lastly sketches the relations of the East with Western Christendom from the time of Michael Cærularius, tracing briefly the friendly and hostile currents which for a time flowed on side by side, the former gradually dwindling away until it was finally absorbed in the latter. The work closes with a glance at the constantly growing catalogue of charges made by the Greeks against the Latins, and an interesting description of the later Greek fables on the origin of the schism and the "Italian heresy."

Dr. Hergenröther has issued, as an appendix to the work, a collection, extending to 180 pages, of Greek fragments, some of Photius himself, others bearing on his life, and for the most part hitherto unpublished. A Latin version is printed concurrently at the foot of each page.

We must conclude by congratulating Dr. Hergenröther on the completion of his great task, and the Catholic literary world on the acquisition of so noble an addition to ecclesiastical learning.

The author in his preface alludes to a phenomenon with which Catholic writers are only too familiar in England, but which we had imagined was less prevalent in Germany: "the ignoring of his work, up to the present moment, by Protestant organs and writers." On the other hand, we cordially sympathize with the pleasure he expresses at the fact that it has attracted attention amongst Russian and Greek men of letters. The day when the Greek schismatics begin to take up the serious study of ecclesiastical history, must be the commencement of a new era in their relations to the Catholic world. Meanwhile we would specially commend Dr. Hergenröther's "Photius" to the notice of those Englishmen, who have lately made such warm demonstrations of sympathy and of desire for ecclesiastical union with the Photian sect.

Mrs. Gerard's Niece. By Lady GEORGIANA FULLERTON. 3 vols. London : Bentley. 1869.

THIS work is a real and solid addition to the innocent pleasures of life. It is one which very few people could have written. Indeed, when we think of writers known to us, we cannot remember one whom we could imagine writing it. Clearly no man, neither Thackeray, nor Dickens, nor Disraeli, nor Walter Scott, could have attempted it. But neither could any woman : neither the authoress of "John Halifax," nor of the "Village on the Cliff," nor of the "Heir of Redclyffe," very highly as we are disposed to place the last of these. Neither again, even less could it have been written by the greatest of female novelists before our own time—Jane Austen. In fact, if it had appeared without a name, we think it would have been the old story, "aut Erasmus aut Diabolus," and that every one who had ever read "Grantley Manor" would have said that it must be by the same author. Contrasting it with her other works, it makes us feel that great as was our pleasure in reading "Constance Sherwood," "A Stormy Life," and "Too Strange not to be True," we can hardly help regretting that Lady Georgiana should ever have directed her powers to write of other times and other states of society than our own. In our judgment she has written nothing since "Grantley Manor" to compare with the work before us. We heartily hope she will not lay down the pen she uses so well, and equally that she will devote herself to describe life as it goes on around her. Women have, as Sir Walter Scott said long ago, a special and peculiar power in this ; and there is a mixture of power, truth, and refinement in the characters drawn by Lady Georgiana which we do not see equalled by those even of any other female writer.

It is no easy matter to write a notice of a new novel, because it is hardly fair to the author to give a sketch of its plot. In speaking of Sir Walter Scott's or Miss Austen's, we take it for granted that every one has read them, or else does not care about stories. But it hardly seems fair : a novel of the present year is like a bottle of champagne, and the reviewer does his author a bad turn if he uncorks and pours it out, leaving it to stand and lose its freshness before the reader gets it. There are few stories which would suffer less by the process than that before us, for the interest is much less in the incidents than in the characters. Indeed, the plot is decidedly the worst part of the whole, and least shows the author's artistic skill. The whole turns upon an accident supposed to have taken place before the action of the book begins, the circumstances of which are so unlikely that one can only say they are perhaps not impossible. This is, no doubt, as far as it goes, a defect in skill. But we confess we think it one of small importance ; for a reader must be of prosaic turn indeed, who is not able to take such a preliminary for granted, and then enjoy the manner in which the characters work out their subsequent course, just as much as if the state of things had

resulted from some probable event. Our only other criticism is that the plot is from the beginning rather too obvious. Few readers, we suppose, get far into the first volume without guessing what is distinctly told them in the third. These however hardly deserve to be called blemishes, in a work so beautiful as that before us.

We have no intention of telling the story ; and shall therefore say only, that the book gives us an account of the lives and loves of several persons in the well-to-do classes of English country life in the present day. It is a striking proof of the greatness of the change which has passed over the national mind within the last forty years, that to say this, almost of itself implies that the interest turns more or less upon religious questions.

Miss Austen was the daughter of a clergyman of unblemished character and repute ; and she was herself a person in all respects exemplary : yet it evidently never occurred to her that perplexity about the line of religious duty could be, to any sober person, one of the practical trials of life. If any writer should undertake to describe the same class of English society in 1870, it would be impossible that that subject could be left out, unless it were deliberately avoided. It forces itself, as one of the prominent characteristics of the day, upon every one who watches the society he sees around him. This does not necessarily imply that our own time is more religious than that in which Miss Austen lived. For there have been times when religious feeling was universal and strong, and when, owing to this very state of things, religious perplexity was unknown. But in a Protestant country that cannot exist ; less than anywhere else, in one so much divided in religious opinion as ours. In England we may confidently say that if, in any age, religious thought is general and earnest, religious perplexity will be little less general. This will be plain to any one who looks back on our history. The educated and political classes seem to have been little troubled with it between 1660 and the earlier part of last century. This was the result of the reaction from Puritanism. But even then, under the surface, religious movement enough and to spare was going on ; and John Wesley was born hardly forty years later. Now we must doubt whether there was any period of English history at which so keen an observer and so accurate a painter as Miss Austen could have written so many novels, entirely omitting any remark which could suggest any thought of doctrinal religion, unless it had been under the Georges. Indeed, we doubt whether—except under the two last Georges—there would have been the total absence of all reference to unbelief as much as to belief. This last feature seems to have resulted from that general reaction in favour of all that was established both in Church and State,—which was caused by the overthrow of social order, as well as of religion, by the French Revolution. Should any one therefore be inclined to blame the degree to which Lady Georgiana Fullerton introduces religious questions in the work before us, our answer would be, that as an artist she could not do otherwise ; for a picture from which religious questions were omitted would not be a picture of the higher stratum of the middle classes in 1870.

Another result of what we must call this reality in her picture is, that the religious Anglicans of the work before us are wholly different from those of “*Grantley Manor*,” for instance, which (if our memory does not deceive us)

was published more than twenty years ago. The change is a real one, and could not have escaped so observant an artist. It may be described in few words as the change from the disciples of Mr. Newman to those of Mr. Mackonochie.

The "Spectator" seems to us to have overlooked this, in a very fair and appreciative review of the work before us. The writer says : "If Lady Georgiana Fullerton really hopes that her work will be of any use in setting forward the divine claim of her adopted Church (the Roman) to the obedience of Englishmen and Englishwomen, she would have done better to give less attention to the Anglican controversy with Rome, in dealing with which she can secure an easy triumph; and do a little, at least, to the far more powerful and impressive objections which genuine Protestants urge." The writer proceeds to state some of what may be called the sceptical or rationalistic objections to the Catholic Faith. No doubt these are likely to last much longer, and spread much farther than the others; but not to say that they are of a kind with which a religious writer may well be pardoned for not being willing to grapple, and with regard to which she might possibly not trust her own powers, although (for our own part we should most gladly see Lady Georgiana Fullerton enter upon this part of the subject) we believe that in truth her picture of the particular section of English society described in the book before us—that of religious ladies of the class of the country gentry and of the beneficed clergy—is more true to nature, in that she has not represented them as either meeting with, or perplexed by, rationalistic doubts against Christian belief. Be this as it may, the characters represented seem to look only upon two systems of belief as practically possible, that of the Ritualists, and that of the Church.

For ourselves we confess, that, as a general rule, we are so little drawn towards controversial novels that we took up this without great expectations. But we were soon undeceived. It could hardly fail to attract any one, however little he might care about the religious questions touched, if he delights in skilful delineation of character.

The three principal characters are such real creations of the imagination, as by themselves to prove that the author who conceived them possesses the peculiar power of great dramatists. We insist the rather on this because it contrasts most favourably with the class of novels which is the characteristic and the disgrace of our contemporary literature. In Miss Braddon's novels, for instance, the interest (such as it is) consists merely in the strangeness of the crimes committed by, and of the events happening to, somebody—by whom committed or to whom happening makes no difference. It would do just as well and be just as natural, if A. were to murder B. and C., and to marry D. and E. and F. as it does when B. murders A. and C., and marries nearly all the remainder of the alphabet. So that there are murders and polygamies enough, it makes no real difference who commits them. Anything that is said or done would suit one character pretty much about as well as another. The writer's talent is shown in concealing what the *dénouement* is to be long enough to excite the reader's curiosity and keep it active to the end. This of course requires talent of a certain kind, but neither shows nor exercises dramatic powers. Neither indeed does that older style of writing

of which Miss Edgeworth is the best example, in which we have, not men and women, but virtues and vices called by masculine and feminine names, each of which begins with a capital. Edgar, Annie, and Ita, on the contrary, are real people with distinct human characters. We should know any one of them at once if we met them in society. Not a saying or an act is ascribed to any one of them, which would not lose its force and meaning and be out of place if transferred to any other; and yet so far from being mere virtues and vices they are characters made up of excellences and defects, like those of the men and women around us. It is not possible to show this by quotations expressly, because the author, with true dramatic power, instead of telling us what they were, leaves them to show it for themselves as the story goes on. Ita clearly would have been far preferable to Annie as a companion in life. We can quite feel what is said of her. "There was a charm which told on everybody she approached. It was felt by the rough peasants of the moorlands as much as by persons of refinement and education. She had a gift which when it is joined with quick, tender feelings and earnestness of spirit, exercises a wonderful influence on all sorts of persons. It is not wit—not even humour; it is what the French call *le mot pour rire*. It is like the ripple of the stream; it gladdens everything, and gladness is so much wanted by weary hearts. A smile on the face of a poor man has a countless value. 'She is a bit of sunshine'—'she is a good sight for sore eyes'—'she is a terrible one for cheering one up' were the common sayings in the mouths of the poor as Ita went in and out of their cottages" (vol. i. 324). This is exactly what every reader feels he would have said himself if he had been thrown into her company, to the very end of the book, from the scene which describes her characteristic introduction of herself (vol. i. p. 97).

"Annie saw a small figure hastening towards her whom she, of course, knew must be the young lady of the house—the little Miss Flower she was to make acquaintance with. 'It is rather a bore without any one to introduce me,' she thought; however, starting up, she advanced a few steps towards the breathless girl, who had been running to meet her. They both smiled and shook hands. 'You are Miss Derwent, I suppose?' 'Yes! and you, Miss Flower?' 'I am Ita; nobody calls me anything else.'"

But Annie Derwent herself, though much less attractive as a companion, is a more masterly, because a far more difficult, conception to imagine and describe. We can hardly say we ever met exactly an Annie Derwent, but her character is so manifestly one and in keeping with itself that one feels one might meet her any day. Her straightforward, conscientious, prosaic, unsympathizing nature, combined with a power and willingness to make a total sacrifice of herself and her own interests for the few she really loves. Then her religious character is quite in keeping with this. She loves intensely a far-going Ritualist clergyman, and is willing to do anything for him; but her simple reality makes her quite unable to throw herself by an act of will into what she feels to be the novelties and unrealities of his religious system, and her convictions as well as her heart clings to the "High and Dry" teaching, and the square pews which she had been brought up to venerate. And yet it is quite in keeping with the same character that she should show herself afterwards quite capable of understanding what real

authority means. But we must keep our resolution, and not lift up the veil from her after-course. Edgar Derwent the clergyman, again, is admirably drawn. It is of real use to a Catholic to study such a character. When we meet with one more or less like it in real life, we are so much tempted to think it impossible the man can really believe what he professes, that it is a lesson of charitable judgment to observe how exactly in keeping Edgar's obstinate adherence to what is so strangely self-contradicting fits into and forms part of his character. Mrs. Gerard herself, though only a sketch, is also very distinctly in outline. It is also a pleasure to those who remember "Grantley Manor" to meet again some of the persons with whom they made intimate acquaintance there. We heartily hope this is not to be the last tory of our own day, for which we are to be indebted to Lady Georgiana Fullerton.

A Sketch of the Life of St. Paula. From the French. London: Burns, Oates, & Co.

WE do not know that we can say anything which would express the beauty of this little sketch so perfectly, as to translate the quotation of S. Francis of Sales' words in the beginning of the work now before us. "S. Paula, who like a beautiful and fragrant violet has been so sweet to behold in the garden of the Church." No one can fully estimate a Saint except a Saint. And thus these few words of the most charming of the French canonized writers go further to express S. Paula's character than pages written by an ordinary person might do.

S. Francis too—who himself led to renounce the world a lady in the highest ranks of society, much gifted in every way, and especially in mind—could peculiarly enter into S. Paula's character and position; a woman with high intellectual attainments, left early a widow, with a young family of children, amongst which was an only son,—in all these respects closely resembling S. Jane Frances de Chantal. Yet even more powerful perhaps than that great Saint, it would seem, were S. Paula's maternal affections; tried by Our Lord to the uttermost, by the deaths of the most tenderly beloved of her children. And we have an extract from a most beautiful letter from S. Jerome to his grieving disciple and penitent, whose heart was almost broken by the loss of her first and most gifted child, Blesilla. The magnificent and heavenly force of S. Jerome's words, drawing the mother's riven heart to the feet of the Lord Jesus, joined with his deep human sympathy for her great sorrow, goes far to prove the power of the Christian priest to enter into and understand the breaking of those ties which he has never himself experienced. But we must leave this interesting little book to display its own attractions. We have but one regret about it, and that is its brevity. The life of S. Paula is a heavenly romance; and we shall rejoice when the translation of the Abbé Lagrange's "*Histoire de Ste. Paule*" appears, as the present pamphlet promises.

The Life of S. Patrick, from Walter Harris's Translation of Sir James Ware's works, together with the "Confessio Sancti Patricii" and the "Epistola ad Christianos Tyranni Corotici subditos" Sti. Patricii. Collected and Edited by Rev. JOHN LYNCH, P.P., Ballymena. London and Dublin : Moffat & Co.

THE publication of these opuscula, and their sale for sixpence, is an act of devotion on the part of the parish priest of Ballymena to the patron saint, which we wish rather than hope may be attended by no loss to himself. By inserting the two memorable tracts of S. Patrick in the original Latin and without a translation, he shows that he trusts to the support of educated readers. Yet we fear he shows that he rates too highly the average knowledge even of Latin readers, when he sets before them the "Life of S. Patrick," with no further explanation than that it is "from Walter Harris's Translation of Sir James Ware's works." The pamphlet contains nothing of his own except a short letter, explaining that his "attention was drawn to the works of Sir James Ware by the notice in the newspapers that Dr. Todd's copy sold for £450." He found that the "Life" "testified to S. Patrick's orthodox education and Roman Catholicism," and he resolved to reprint it in a form which would bring these two facts before "every Catholic and Protestant in the province." No one can think this useless, because respectable men still continue to claim S. Patrick as a Protestant. It is somewhat hopeless to meet such a claim by any argument. We only regret that he did not explain that Sir James Ware was a Protestant of the days of Strafford and Laud, who was committed to the Tower and narrowly enough escaped their fate, having been taken at sea when bearing orders from Charles to Ormond, was afterwards an exile in France, and was offered an Irish Peerage after the Restoration, which he survived only six years. His works are one of the chief storehouses of Irish antiquities, and (as appeared at Dr. Todd's sale) rare enough. A Walter Harris, who published the translation from which this life is reprinted, was the husband of his granddaughter. The new edition explains, in a footnote, that he gives an extract from Harris's preface, with "the double purpose of showing what pains he took to collect information, and how unlikely he would be to state anything too favourably of Rome and Romanism. The fact is, both grandson and grandfather were bigoted Protestants."

Life of J. Théophane Vénard, Martyr in Tonquin. Translated from the French by Lady HERBERT. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

WE have here another interesting life of a martyr missionary, whose sweet and gentle disposition would almost seem to have in some respects unfitted him for the severe and terrible battle-field on which he so ardently desired to enter, were it not that these very qualities, when refined and proved in the fire of suffering and fortified by the power of the Catholic Church, often prove most powerful engines for the advancement of her glory. Théophane Vénard showed early marks of being peculiarly called to work for God, and received divine favours granted only to our Lord's most devoted servants. This we see in the heavenly assurance given him of his mother's eternal happiness. For the great sorrow of her loss occurred to him when a boy at college ; and the special love for her, which seems to belong pre-eminently to priests and those called to be such, caused the wound to be so great, as doubtless to wean him yet more effectually from this world, and cause him to press forward in his path to Heaven. The letters to his friends, and especially those to his sister after the commencement of his missionary labours, are full of interest, and will well repay a perusal of the little work, which appears to be a very nice translation.

One of the fruits of the establishment of a Foreign Missionary College amongst us is certainly the development of that higher spirit of Apostolic devotedness which is characteristic of the Foreign Missionary vocation. This, we may hope, will show itself in the examples which, in process of time, may come forth from S. Joseph's College at Mill Hill ; but even already we are beholden to it ; for it is creating a Foreign Missionary Library formed of the Lives of Martyrs who have suffered in our own day, as well as of those who have distinguished themselves by this missionary career of zeal and devotedness in earlier, though still in modern times. The publication of the Oratorian series of the Lives of the Saints was one of the great benefits bestowed by the Congregation of the Oratory on its first institution among us upon all English Catholics. A similar idea, though limited quite naturally to missionary life, is developing itself in the establishment of S. Joseph's Society of the Sacred Heart for Foreign Missions by its issue of its Foreign Missionary series of Lives. It is to this series that the Life of Vénard belongs ; and this is to be followed by a variety of other Lives, which we understand are being written or translated by various hands. To judge by the sample we have before us, we doubt not but that they will be looked forward to with considerable interest. Few things are more calculated to lift up, and to set on fire with zeal the hearts of the young and generous, than the perusal of the Lives of those who, though not canonized because only just gone to their reward, have lived in our own day ; and therefore seem to have something more in common with us than those who are removed from us by lapse of time and an earlier state of civilization.

Good Deeds ; Sketches of Holy and Devoted Lives. Vol. I. Part I. London : John Philp.

THE first part of the serial ingeniously named "Good Deeds," as opposed to "Good Words," gives great promise of what we may expect in the ensuing numbers. The Lives contained in it are all new to the English reader, and possess as much interest as they give edification. The history of the "Count and Countess de la Garaye" is especially remarkable as exhibiting the sanctity attained by a married couple in the world, who persevered in a life wholly devoted to piety and good works, without ever entertaining the idea, so universal among souls aspiring to holiness, of retiring into the cloister.

The object of this useful little publication is so well expressed in the "Editor's Preface," that we cannot do better than give an extract :—

"Whilst 'Good Words' are abundant on all sides, it is *our* project to keep before the eyes of the public, and those of our youth in particular, the *deeds* of Holy and Devoted Persons. Their lives are but the Parable of the 'Good Samaritan' in practice. They are not content to say to their brethren : '*Be ye warmed, be ye clothed,*' and to do nothing further ; those Holy Persons—sketches of whose lives we propose to give from time to time—are prompted by the grace of God, to *show their Faith by their Works*."*

The Year of Preparation for the Vatican Council. Including the original and English of the Encyclical and Syllabus, and of the Papal Documents connected with its convocation. London : Burns, Oates, & Co., 1869.

THIS most useful little book is brought out by Dr. Vaughan. The Preface says :—

"The Church of God is a perfect kingdom, not of this world, but *in* it. It is a kingdom of souls, and *has* a Divine Mission to gather into itself the whole human race. It has a Divine right to whatever is necessary for its perfect organization and for the fulfilment of its Divine Mission. As there is no limit in point of time or place to its mission, so there is no exemption to the obedience due to its authority when once recognized.

"The General Council then is re-union in one place of the Apostolate dispersed throughout the world under the authority and direction of its divinely appointed head, whose office is to 'confirm his brethren,' and whose 'faith shall not fail.' Human society cannot but be affected by the decision of the Council. Gainsay it as scoffers and unbelievers may, mankind will be influenced by its decision. Individuals may have eyes and see not, and ears and hear not ; but God Himself will solemnly speak to the world through

* S. James, ch. ii. 18.

the infallible decision of the Council of His Church, and the spirit of the Lord will fill the face of the earth as the waters cover the sea.

"There is much misconception as to the nature of a General Council. Subjects directly connected with it are ordinarily studied only by Theologians and Canonists. In the midst, too, of the Babel of tongues and newspapers in which we live, circumstances attendant upon the convocation of the Vatican Council have been continually repeated inaccurately. The following pages, therefore, may be useful to all who desire correct and trustworthy information. They are reprinted chiefly from the supplements on the Council which have appeared in the 'Tablet' newspaper during the last year."

This being the case, it is less necessary that we should give any detailed account of the original part of the volume, as we imagine that there are not many of our readers who have not had the opportunity of studying the supplements. Those who value the information obtained from them, will be the first to thank Dr. Vaughan for collecting and republishing them; for writings in a newspaper form are so difficult to keep that it is a decided gain to have them put together in the form of a small volume. We may add that he tells us "the theological and legal part of the work is due almost entirely to the pen of Mr. David Lewis, whose learning and accuracy are too well known to need commendation, while the narrative of current events has been prepared by other trustworthy and competent hands." From what we have already said our readers will quite understand the principles which have guided the writers of the original portion of this volume, without the necessity of our saying how closely they coincide with our own. To a certain degree they are necessarily under a disadvantage, from the circumstance of the chapters having been written not as a whole but for publication week by week, because this inevitably interferes more or less with the arrangement adopted in drawing up a volume. This necessary drawback upon the form in which the work originally appeared has been, as far as possible, compensated for by a copious table of contents, which enables the reader without difficulty to find the place in which each subject is treated.

The Introduction explains the importance and rarity of the event which we are now watching.

"The Council of Trent is the last of the General Councils, and the last session of that assembly was held on the 4th of December, 1563. It is now three hundred years since the last General Council was held, and we are living as far from that day as the Fathers at Nice, who assisted for the first time in an œcumenical synod, were from the foundation of the Church. Nine generations of men and thirty-one Popes have passed away since the close of the Council of Trent" (p. 4).

Then it is shown that the convocation of a Council implies "at least something unusual," that "the Pope calls the Council because the world is sick"; that the Pope does not merely invite the Prelates to attend him, but "commands their attendance, reminds them of their obedience due to him, and the sanctions guarding that obedience." The chapters which follow explain who have the right of sitting in General Councils, and that they can be called only by the Pope, and are presided over by him or his representatives. Then the false notions entertained by many persons are refuted.

The sixth chapter begins the narrative of the events leading to the present Council, of the steps he has taken in calling it together, especially with regard to the schismatical Bishops of the East, and how his advances were received by different Eastern Bishops. Chapter X. gives some account of the history of the dealings of the Church with the Greek schism in times past ; and the last chapters touch several other points with regard to past Councils, and their relations to the Supreme Pontiffs.

We will add that several important documents are republished in this volume, in Latin and in an English translation ; among which are the well-known Syllabus, and the Encyclical by which it was accompanied ; the Bull calling the Council, and dated on the Feast of S. Peter and S. Paul, 1868 ; the Apostolic Letters to the Bishops of the Eastern Rite not in communion with the Apostolic See, dated on the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, 1868 ; those addressed to all Protestants and other non-Catholics five days later ; the Letter addressed to the Archbishop of Westminster, on the occasion of Dr. Cumming's desire to be heard at the Council, September 4, 1869 ; and that to the same prelate announcing that the Holy Father has appointed theologians to confer with such Protestants as desire it, dated October 30, 1869.

Pilgrimages in the Pyrenees and Landes. By DENIS SHYNE LAWLOR, Esq.
Longmans. 1870.

IT is some time since we have read a new book with so much interest as this. There is no part of France in which so much of Catholic tradition has been preserved as in its south-western corner ; and it is curious to observe how little it has been made known even to Catholics in England and Ireland. Before the great deluge of revolution swept over that noble land, it was thickly sown with time-honoured sanctuaries and pilgrimages, and although the agents of the Revolution flattered themselves that all was swept away by its fury, the waters had hardly subsided when the faithful people were found worshipping at the shrines where their fathers had knelt. Connected with each of these sanctuaries there was some ancient tradition of supernatural events by which in times long past the favoured spot had been hallowed. In most instances they seem to have been connected with a visible appearance of the ever blessed Mother of God. The line taken by the irreligious party in France, and indeed, throughout Europe, with regard to such accounts, has been to treat them as utterly undeserving of notice ; they were the superstitions of a benighted age, and if anything had been needed to convince sensible men of their absurdity, it was found in the fact that, although the ancient sanctuaries retained their hold upon the ignorant vulgar, no one ever heard nowadays of any new events of the same kind as those from which their celebrity was supposed to have arisen. It is remarkable that this boast should have been met at all ; for the Almighty Lord of the Church

has seldom, perhaps never, vouchsafed any manifestation of His power in confutation of the blasphemies of His enemies. But to say nothing of *La Salette*, which was in a part of France comparatively remote from these ancient shrines, and of which, moreover, some good Catholics, to say the least, have doubted, it has pleased God to grant, in the midst of the sanctuaries of the Pyrenees, a new manifestation of the power and love of His Blessed Mother, from which has arisen the pilgrimage of our Lady of Lourdes. The last took place in the year 1858, and the Bishop of Tarbes, whose diocese was honoured by being the scene of it, after using, it would seem, a caution if anything exceeding even that which is habitual with the Church in giving her sanction to any new manifestation of this kind, has issued a pastoral, in which, after detailing at length the circumstances of the case, he declares :—

“ We pronounce that Mary Immaculate, Mother of God, did really appear to Bernadette Soubirous, on February 11th, 1858, and on subsequent days, to the number of eighteen times, in the grotto of Massabielle, near the city of Lourdes ; that this apparition possesses all the characters of truth, and that the faithful are justified in believing it with certainty. We humbly submit this, our judgment, to the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff, who is charged with the government of the Universal Church.

“ We authorize in our diocese the veneration (*culte*) of our Lady of the grotto of Lourdes. To conform ourselves to the will of the Blessed Virgin, several times expressed during the apparitions, we propose to build a sanctuary on the land of the grotto, which has become the property of the bishops of Tarbes. In consequence of the difficulties of the site, this building will be a work of much time and considerable cost. Thus, to realize our pious purpose, we shall need the assistance not only of the clergy and faithful of our diocese, but that of all France and of foreign countries. We appeal to their generous hearts, and particularly to those pious persons of all countries who are devoted to the veneration of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary.”

This pastoral is dated January 18th, 1864, and contains particular directions as to the persons authorized to receive subscriptions for the purpose.

Thus, then, we have a new pilgrimage and sanctuary established in the midst of that favoured land, already consecrated by those of our Lady of Bétharam ; of our Lady of Garaïsa ; of our Lady of Sarrance ; of our Lady of Piétat ; of our Lady of Héas ; of our Lady Bourisp ; of our Lady of Médous ; of our Lady of Nestes ; of S. Savin, the anchorite of the Val de Lavédan ; and of S. Bertrand of Comminges. Happy land, on which Mary has looked with a degree of predilection which would suggest to a fanciful mind that she saw in its mountains and streams something that reminded her of the beloved Galilee, of the hill-side village which was honoured by her dwelling when the angel first greeted her with that *Ave gratia plena* which, since she herself was taken up to the glory whence she came, has never ceased to echo through the mountains, and plains, the cities and villages, the lands and oceans of earth. Or will not faith rather say, happy land in which she has seen, nay, still sees, in many an innocent heart, the faint and feeble reflection of what hers then was, many a penitent in whom she sees repeated that Blessed Magdalene who was honoured to be her companion beneath the Cross and beside the empty sepulchre.

Alas, when so vast a number of our countrymen are year by year attracted to that glorious land, how heartrending it is to think that among them all so large a proportion frequent it only in idleness and for the sake of frivolous society ; and that of those who care more for its special charm, so many care only for its medicinal springs or its natural beauties, and look upon the faith and devotion of its children with cold and insolent contempt. How sad that they should thus touch the unseen world, and yet be unconscious of its nearness. Surely it is but too certain that if their lot had been cast eighteen centuries ago, and if circumstances or taste had attracted them to Nazareth itself, they would have cared only for the lake and the mountain, and that the Presence by which, in the sight of the Eternal Father and the Blessed Angels, it was made to be a very Heaven upon Earth would have seemed to them something common-place and unimportant.

But there were even then a few who found in the child of the carpenter the Salvation of God, a light to lighten the gentiles, and to be the glory of his people Israel ; and there are some among our countrymen who find in the faith of the Pyrenean peasants and the self-denying sanctity of their priests and bishops, something even more beautiful to the inward eye than all the majesty of mountains, forests, lakes, and streams ; and who deem the land more honoured by having been marked by the especial favour of Mary Immaculate than by all the grandest features of natural creation.

The author of the volume before us is one of these. We hail his work not merely as one of so much interest, especially in that part which gives the account of Lourdes, that for ourselves we found it quite impossible to put it down when we had once taken it up, but as a token of the graces with which it has pleased God to favour our own islands. There has certainly been no period since the change of religion in England at which such a work could possibly have been published by an Irish country gentleman, and that not only because persecution would have made it little better than madness to publish it, but because it was only among a sprinkling of that class that the faith of their fathers still survived. For totally as the wicked policy of past times has failed to separate the Irish nation from the Church, one of the main causes of the evils of Ireland is its success in establishing a Protestant nobility and squirearchy. This has been done, not only by confiscations and wholesale grants of land to Protestant adventurers, but by the slower operation of unjust laws, which have in too many instances availed to compel the education as Protestants of children upon whom devolved the representation of ancient Catholic families. Nor did the few Catholic families which retained both their faith and the remnant at least of their lands escape uninjured. It is only of yesterday that Ireland has possessed a Catholic University, to which indeed the law even yet has not accorded equality of rights with Protestant and anti-Catholic institutions. The gentry, therefore, even when they have not fallen away from the Church, have seldom been properly trained in its principles. No wonder, that under such circumstances it has been by the mass of the nation, not by the landed gentry, that the Catholic Church has been maintained in Ireland. We hail, therefore, with double pleasure such a work as this from a man in Mr. Lawlor's position. His book is marked with proofs, not of the Faith only, but of the courage of his nation,

for there are many who would shrink less from physical danger than from the ridicule which might attach to the open confession of belief in the power of a glorious Mother and of her continued intervention in earthly affairs.

The whole volume interested us greatly. Mr. Lawlor is evidently one of those who see foreign lands through a medium of sympathy with all that is pure and beautiful, by which they are invested with a glow which is wholly wanting to many travellers. But we must confine ourselves to the single case of Lourdes. The whole account of the origin and progress of this new shrine is put before us in the most lively manner—the natural beauty of the scene, the character of the favoured child who was selected by Her whom all generations call Blessed, to look upon herself, and hear her voice, and carry her orders to the bishop and clergy. Then, the extreme caution with which the message was received, which fully confirmed what we have long seen, that there is no class of believers so slow to be convinced of the reality of any new supernatural manifestation as priests and bishops, just as all who know anything on the subject are aware that it is much easier to convince any ordinary layman of respectable character of the reality of a miracle, than to obtain for it the approbation of the Roman Congregation. No doubt in the present day, when a large part of the world is only too ready to put down as priestcraft every manifestation of Divine power; it is doubly necessary that the ecclesiastical authorities should be doubly cautious in showing that they have nothing more to do with such events than to obey what has been proved to be an order from on high. Accordingly the child had seen our Blessed Lady again and again, and had carried a message from Her to the parish priest directing that a church should be built over the cave in which she appeared, and lay visitors, men, women, and children had been flocking to the spot from considerable distances for many weeks before it had been visited by a single ecclesiastic. Indeed, the priests of the diocese were strictly forbidden by the bishop to go to the place, although it was for weeks crowded by laity of all ages and both sexes. It is curious to see how the matter was treated by the French officials. The Minister of Public Instruction took alarm, and wrote to the Prefect to say, the best thing was to prevent access to the cave, but that it might be dangerous to do so *brusquement*. No one will be surprised that this gentleman, who is pleased to call himself a Protestant, was influenced only by a strong “opinion that an end ought to be put to proceedings which might compromise the interests of Catholicism, and weaken religious feelings in the people.” The local Prefect had the child arrested, and was going to send her to a lunatic asylum. This the parish priest stoutly opposed. Many offerings had been made by the people; these he ordered to be taken away. It could not be done without a cart. The Postmaster refused to allow any of his horses to be used. However, many persons in the town kept horses and carriages of all kinds, as it is on the way to the baths in the mountains. The police went from one to another all over the town, followed by the populace, with uncomplimentary exclamations. They feared violence from the people, which probably would have followed if the Curé had not exerted himself to quiet them. The police offered thirty francs, and the people cried out, that was the sum given to Judas. At last a blacksmith's daughter was tempted to let a cart, which went to the cave.

"Crucifixes, statuettes of the Blessed Virgin, devotional pictures, rosaries, beads, necklaces, jewels lay scattered on the ground or in the nooks of the rocks. Bits of carpeting in some places were spread under the images of our Lady; pious hands had brought innumerable bouquets, and this rustic sanctuary was perfumed by the fresh garlands of the floral month of May. Several thousand francs in silver and copper were lying on the floor, upon which no thief had ever dared to place his sacrilegious hand, notwithstanding the facility for a midnight depredation presented by the unguarded loneliness of the spot. This crime was reserved for the myrmidons of the Government" (p. 359).

Our space obliges us to cut short the narrative of the measures taken by the police in order to maintain "Catholicism and the religious feelings of the people," by the prosecution of those who ventured to pray at the place. An end was put to this at last by the personal interference of the Emperor.

We must end our notice; and we do it with less regret because we hope we have said enough to induce our readers to read Mr. Lawlor's book for themselves.

Illustrations of Jack Cade's Rebellion, from Researches in the Guildhall Records; together with some newly-found Letters of Lord Bacon, &c. By B. BROGDEN ORRIDGE, F.G.S. To which are added Contributions by W. DURRANT COOPER, F.S.A., on the *Rising of Cade and his Followers in Kent and Sussex*. London: Hotten. 1869.

THE popular notions of Jack Cade are derived from Shakespeare. He comes upon the stage at Blackheath, in the second scene of the fourth act of the Second Part of "King Henry VI." He announces himself as the son of a Mortimer by a Plantagenet mother, and the husband of a Lacy; the by-play of his ragamuffin followers qualifying all these statements by a running commentary very derogatory to such pretensions. His conduct is generally in keeping with that of the leader of such a mob, and the sole good quality he exhibits is a certain amount of brute courage. After becoming master of the city of London, he fights an indecisive battle at London Bridge, is at last defeated at Southwark, and, flying into Kent, is slain by Alexander Iden, in whose garden he had taken refuge. There are good reasons for thinking that these notions are to a great extent mistaken. It is true that Cade (or whatever his name was) entered the city, where many of his followers so misbehaved themselves as to alienate from him the powerful Yorkist party, of which he was the avowed leader, and by whose help he had succeeded so far; that he was afterwards defeated, his army scattered, and himself slain. But it seems highly probable that his name was not Cade at all; that, if not the grandson of the Earl of March, he was really one of the Mortimer family; and it is certain that he was a person of knightly bearing and presence, and that the recruits raised by him, so far from being (as Sir Humphrey Stafford calls them in the play) "the filth and scum of Kent, marked for the gallows,"

were levied in due form by the constables in many of the hundreds, included many of the gentry and yeomen of Kent, Sussex, and Surrey, and had amongst them persons of such dignity and authority as the Abbot of Battle, the Prior of Lewes, and other ecclesiastics.

A rising took place in Kent in the beginning of the year 1450. It was headed by Thomas Cheyney, a fuller of Canterbury, commonly called "*Blewberd*." He was taken and executed, and his head was ordered to be exposed at Canterbury; but the sheriffs of London found it hard to get any one who would venture to carry it there, for fear of being killed, so great was "*Blewberd's*" popularity. The more serious insurrection under Cade broke out on Whit-Sunday, the 24th of May, of the same year. On the 1st of June, the rebel camp was fixed at Blackheath; but they afterwards retreated to Sevenoaks, where the Staffords, who went in pursuit of them, were killed. After this the men of Kent were joined by strong contingents from Sussex and Surrey. Thus reinforced, they marched back to Blackheath, and from that to London, which they entered on the 3rd of July. In London they received a large reinforcement from Essex. On the 4th, Lord Say, who, as Lord Lieutenant of Kent, was particularly obnoxious to them, was beheaded by order of Cade's justiciary, as well as his son-in-law, Crowmer, the Sheriff of Kent. It is not clear whether it was by Cade's orders, or in spite of them, that his followers, or a large proportion of them, took to pillaging the city; but that proceeding raised the citizens against them, and, on the night of the 5th, Cade's men with difficulty held their own on London Bridge. Reduced to such a critical position, he was glad to treat with the king for a pardon. But he insisted on the acceptance of the Bill of Petitions, which the Privy Council had previously rejected. We need not go into the heads of complaint. Enough to say that they were admitted, and a pardon granted, in which the leader of the insurgents was plainly called John Mortimer. After being pardoned, most of Cade's followers dispersed; but, alleging that the pardons were insufficient without the sanction of Parliament, he continued in arms. A proclamation was issued against him on the 10th of July, in which the name of Mortimer was no longer used, but he was called John Cade. Alexander Iden, the new sheriff of Kent, was active in his pursuit, and came upon him at Heathfield, in Sussex, where the "Captain of the Commons of Kent" received a mortal wound, of which he died in a cart on his way to London:—

"His head was stuck on London Bridge, with the face towards Kent, and his body quartered. One quarter was sent to Blackheath; a second to Norwich, where the bishop (Walter Harp) was supposed to favour the cause of the Duke of York; a third to Salisbury: and the fourth to Gloucester, the Abbot of St. Peter's there being also a favourer of the cause" (p. 34).

Mr. Durrant Cooper, to whose researches we are indebted for the interesting facts we have summarized, does not take much pains to make out (if, indeed, it be possible) who Cade really was. Two successive acts of attainder were passed, by which his "goods, lands, tenements, rents, and possessions" were forfeited to the king, and his blood was declared corrupt. Mr. Cooper justly remarks that, if he had been a low-born person, no act of attainder would have any meaning in his case, and it would have been superfluous to declare

his blood corrupt. That he was not a "tanner of Ashford" is clear. Mr. Brogden Orridge quotes from Dean Hook's "Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury" a statement to the effect that he was "an unknown Irishman who, in order to give political significance to the insurrection, assumed to be Sir John Mortimer, brother to the Earl of March." The introduction of this "unknown" quantity complicates the solution of the problem immensely. A known Englishman, whether of high or low origin, can easily be conceived in the position of Captain of the Commons of Kent, even in the middle of the fifteenth century. But an unknown Irishman in that position would be the wrongest man in the wrongest place that ever was. It is said that he was put forward by the Duke of York to test the feeling of England in favour of his family claims, and that was why he took the name of Mortimer. But it is admitted that he had served with distinction in the French wars; that his bearing was princely; and that, to a commanding figure, he added "a pregnant wit." His whole career before entering London was in keeping with this character. He levied war according to all the established rules; an eminent merchant in London was his recognized agent; passports to and from his camp were duly signed and issued. There is a fact upon which Mr. Cooper, though he refers to it in passing, lays no stress, and that is, that Cade (or Mortimer) had his regular "state" or household, in which no less a person than Robert Poynings,* the Countess of Northumberland's uncle, held the post of "Carver and Sewer." This evidence seems to us very material in determining the question whether he was a mock or a real Mortimer. Poynings, a devoted Yorkist, saw no degradation in waiting on a prince of the true Royal House. But Poynings, a noble Englishman, would not have stooped to such service towards a low-born impostor, or an impostor of any sort, born at no matter which side of the Channel. All the known facts of the case lead to a strong presumption that the Captain of Kent was, what he claimed to be, Sir John Mortimer, cousin of the Duke of York, very probably born in Ireland, but recognized by his followers in England as a member of the rightful Royal family. We have no wish to fall into the bad habit, of late too common with those engaged in historical researches, of trying to rehabilitate all the recognized rascals of history; but it is clear, at any rate, that Shakespeare's Jack Cade is a gross caricature of the original, who (to make a comparison which a Mortimer would justly think odious) was quite as great a hero as the Don Juan Prim of our century, and certainly a better gentleman.

This volume gives many interesting details connected with Sir Thomas Cooke, Cade's London agent. Francis Bacon and Robert Cecil were descended from him, and his blood flows in the veins of the present Dukes of Beaufort and Rutland and of the Marquis of Salisbury.

* Father of Sir Edward Poynings, so well known in Irish history.

Carlow College Magazine, November, 1869, and February, 1870. Carlow : Fitzsimon.

LAST November the Editor of this magazine inserted an article called "Objectivism No. I."; which ended with saying, that the writer hoped to continue the subject in the next number. We inferred therefore that a sequel was to come, and waited accordingly ; but the Editor explains in February that he is expecting our reply. We have therefore read carefully the article of November.

We gather therefrom, that the writer agrees substantially with our philosophical views ; but he certainly still considers that his words of last May, on the subject of ontologism, do not legitimately bear the meaning which we gave them. Now it is most undesirable, that those who are in substantial agreement on doctrine, should dissipate their strength by mutual contention ; and we will say therefore what little we have to say as uncontroversially as possible.

It amounts to this. There are one or two arguments adduced by him which do not convince us, and one or two propositions stated with which we cannot coincide. But on the whole we must admit, that the sentences to which we objected are capable of a different interpretation from that which we gave them ; and we must express therefore our sincere regret for having assumed that they were intended in a sense, which the writer agrees with us in considering objectionable.

On the other hand we are glad that the writer has been led to explain one or two passages which, as they stood, were open to misapprehension.

WE have received the sheets of Mr. Lewis's translation of S. Teresa's autobiography ; but too late for notice this quarter. The work itself however is so incomparable, and Mr. Lewis's rare faithfulness and felicity as a translator are known so well, that no words of ours can be necessary to make the volume eagerly looked for.

WE are very glad to find the "Atlantis" again published by the Catholic University of Ireland : and we observe that F. Newman has testified his continued interest in the periodical, by contributing a paper. The number reached us too late to give us opportunity for criticism this quarter, but we will not fail to notice it in our next number.

F. BOTTALLA's long expected volume on Pontifical infallibility will appear very soon after our own publication ; and he has most kindly forwarded us the proof-sheets up to p. 320. All this part of the volume is occupied with the "subject" of infallibility. Amidst the distractions of bringing out our number we have as yet had time for no more than a most hasty glance at it ; but we have no hesitation in saying that it is beyond comparison the most complete treatise on the subject which has yet appeared in these islands. We hope to give it a most careful review in our next number.

We have to express great regret for an unfortunate mischance which has prevented us from giving a notice this quarter of F. Gasparini's "Attributes of Christ." We trust we shall without fail give a full account of the excellent volume in our next number.

INDEX.



- ADDRESS of the Irish Bishops, *reviewed*, 1.
- BILL to provide for Public Elementary Education, *reviewed*, 430.
- Bill for Legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, *reviewed*, 56.
- Bishops (the), Irish, Resolutions on Education, 8.
- Boucarut (Abbé), Theologia de Sanctissimâ Virgine Mariâ, *noticed*, 245.
- Brahmo Somaj (The), Vindicated, *reviewed*, 313.
- Brahmo Somaj (The), Lectures and Sermons delivered in connection with, *reviewed*, 313.
- Broeckerkaert (F.), Life of B. Charles Spinola, *noticed*, 281.
- Burton (John H.), History of Scotland, *reviewed*, 123.
- CAMPBELL (Arabella), Life of Fra Paolo Sarpi, *reviewed*, 347.
- Campbell (George), The Irish Land, *reviewed*, 165.
- Carlow College Magazine, *noticed*, 297, 572.
- Catholic Directory (The), *noticed*, 291.
- Catholic Music, *noticed*, 291.
- Charles (S.), and his Fellow-Labourers, *noticed*, 287.
- Christie (F.), Lectures on Union with Rome, *noticed*, 260.
- Civiltà Cattolica, reply to Dr. Dollinger, 509.
- Cobb (G. F.), Separation not Schism, *noticed*, 259.
- CONTROVERSIES ON THE COUNCIL, 481-497 : Attitude of Protestant journals towards the Council, 481-483 ; the Pope's letter to Mgr. Ségur, 484 ; Catholic controversies concerning the Council, 485 ; the Acts of Pius IX., 486 ; his inaugural Encyclical, 487 ; his definition of the Immaculate Conception, 488 ; the Ecclesia docens, 489 ; Dr. Dollinger's assertion, 490 ; supposed case of opposition to dogmas taught by the Pope, 491 ; opportuneness of a definition, 492 ; "The Messenger of the Sacred Heart" on the Dogma, 493 ; general feeling of Catholics on the subject, 494 ; view, in conclusion, of what the Council may do on the subject, 495-497.
- Correspondant (Le), *reviewed*, 184.
- Craven (Mrs.), Adelaide Capece Minutolo, *noticed*, 282.
- DILLON (William), Inaugural Address, *noticed*, 548.
- Döllinger (Dr.), Letters of, 505.
- Doyle (R.), Fairy Land, *noticed*, 295.
- Dupanloup (Mgr.), Observations sur l'Infaillibilité, *reviewed*, 184.
- VOL. XIV.—NO. XXVIII. [*New Series.*] 2 E

EMIDIUS (F.), Manual of the Third Order of S. Francis, *noticed*, 271.

ENGLISH (THE) PROTESTANT MARRIAGE LAW, 56-78 : Vote on the second reading of Mr. Chambers's Bill, 56 ; effect of the Reformation on Christian marriage, 57 ; Protestant references to the Old Testament marriage law, 58, 59 ; substitution of the civil authority for the Church, 60, 61 ; Church and State in the Roman empire, 62 ; Protestantism and the Marriage Law, 63, 64 ; marriages of relatives, 65 ; divorce in Germany, 66 ; the Romans and Goths, 67 ; tendency of events in England, 68, 69 ; divorce legislation, 70-74 ; the Bill of Mr. Chambers, 74 ; its probable effects, if passed, 75 ; arguments for the Bill considered, 76, 77 ; rarity of such marriages in Ireland, 78.

FABER (F. W., D.D.), Devotion to the Pope, *reviewed*, 95.

FABER'S (FATHER) WORK IN THE CHURCH, 95-123 : Homage due to great Christian characters, 95, 96 ; Christianity and modern philanthropy, 97 ; retrospect of English Catholic history, 98-100 ; Cardinal Wiseman's four resolutions, 100 ; F. Faber's vocation, 101 ; his influence in America, 102-104 ; his doctrine as to the Papacy, 105 ; the Pope's note on F. Faber's sermon, 106 ; F. Bonix ou F. Faber, 107 ; Dom Guéranger's estimate of him, 108 ; Dr. Pagani on the "Growth in Holiness," 109 ; F. Faber's eloquence, 110, 111 ; his style and method, 112 ; stress laid by him upon dogma, 113 ; his book on the "Blessed Sacrament," 114 ; his hymns, 115 ; the Oratorian Lives of the Saints, 116, 117 ; circulation of his works, 118 ; his love of Roman usages and devotions, 119 ; the confraternity of the Precious Blood, 120 ; progress of conversions, 121 ; growth of the English Oratory, 122.

Ffoulkes (E.S.), The Roman Index, *noticed*, 257.

Fitzgibbon (Gerald), The Land Difficulty, *reviewed*, 165.

Fortescue (Right Hon. C. P.), Speech on second reading of Irish Land Bill, *reviewed*, 451.

Franzelin (F.), De Deo Trino, *noticed*, 241.

FRA PAOLO SARPI, 347-371 : Various Lives of Sarpi, 347 ; circumstances of his age, 348, 349 ; state of the Dutch provinces, 350 ; state of Venice, 351, 352 ; early life of Sarpi, 353 ; his associates at Venice, 354 ; his appearance, 355 ; his relations to the Holy See, 356 ; Fra Paolo a heretic at heart, 357 ; his language regarding the Pope, 358 ; his political intrigues, 359 ; his English friends, 360 ; the letters of Bishop Bedell, 361 ; M. Papillon, 362 ; letters to Mornay, 363 ; his History of the Council of Trent, 364 ; Ranke's and Cantù's criticism of it, 365 ; first published in London, 366 ; the scar on Fra Paolo's cheek, 367 ; an attempt to assassinate him charged on the Pope, 368-370 ; probable authors of the attempt, 371.

Froude (J. A., M.A.), History of England, *reviewed*, 123.

Fullerton (Lady G.), Mrs. Gerald's Niece, *noticed*, 556.

GALWAY Academical Papers, *noticed*, 262.

Garside (C. B.), Discourses on Parables, *noticed*, 263.

Gladstone (Right Hon. W.), Speech on proposing Irish Land Bill, *reviewed*, 451.

Good Deeds, *noticed*, 563.

Gratry (P.), First Letter to Mgr. Dechamps, *noticed*, 530.

Gratry (P.), Second and Third Letter, *noticed*, 531.

Guéranger (Dom), Pontifical Letter to, 521.

HERGENRÖTHER (Professor), Photius, *noticed*, 553.

Holy Hours (The), *noticed*, 279.

Hosack (John), Mary Queen of Scots, and her Accusers, *reviewed*, 123.

INDIAN THEISM, 313-346 : The effects of English literature on the people of India, 313 ; character of Indian Theism, 314 ; Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics, 315 ; general divisions of religious opinion, 316 ; Catholic view of Indian Theists, 317, 318 ; Indian Theism contemporaneous with European education, 319 ; the Brahmo Somaj, 320, 321 ; its lectures in 1863, 322 ; the position of Keshub Chunder Sen, 323 ; extracts from his lectures, 323-325 ; the Brahminist system, as a religion, dissolving, 326 ; explicit and implicit thought, 327 ; Theists and "the world," 328 ; Mr. Sen on "the world" and true religion, 329 ; on regenerating faith, 330, 331 ; the Brahminist view of faith and humility, 332, 333 ; necessity of Revelation, 334-338 ; relation of the Brahminists to Catholicity, 338-346.

INFALLIBILITY AND THE COUNCIL, 184-224 : Pastorals of Mgr. Dechamps and Archbishop Manning on the question of Infallibility, 184, 185 ; Mgr. Maret's book, 185 ; the book of Janus, 187 ; its unscientific spirit, 188, 189 ; Janus on the Primacy, 190 ; Mr. Allies on the Primacy, 191 ; anti-Catholic spirit of Janus, 192 ; Janus denies infallibility to councils, 193 ; his rule of faith, 194 ; Janus on Papal errors, 195 ; doctrine and discipline, 196 ; the Gallican and the Ultramontane view, 197-200 ; Janus on *ex cathedra* acts, 200 ; the decree of Eugenius IV., 201-204 ; Janus's second class of arguments, 204, 205 ; the Ecclesia docens, 206 ; historical sanctions for the Ultramontane doctrine, 207, 208 ; Archbishop Manning on the historical argument, 208, 209 ; dogmatic results of the Roman bishops, 210, 211 ; early Roman condemnations of doctrine, 212 ; S. Hornisdas on Papal and Conciliar documents, 213, 214 ; the Archbishop on the Coblenz address, 215 ; Mgr. Dupanloup's letters, 216-219 ; his present attitude, 219, 220 ; Mgr. Maret's language on the Church's *Magisterium*, 221, 222 ; reasons for hoping that the Council may define the doctrine of Infallibility, 222.

IS IRELAND IRRECONCILABLE ? 451-481 : State of Ireland during the last autumn and winter, 451, 452 ; peculiar condition of the province of Ulster, 453 ; difficulty of ascertaining true state of Irish public opinion, 454 ; language and traditions of Irish political life, 455 ; conduct of the Liberal party towards Ireland, 456 ; recent Irish ministers, 457 ; the Select Committee of 1865, 458, 459 ; the Administration of Sir Robert Peel, 460, 461 ; Mr. Gladstone's first appearance in Irish affairs, 462, 463 ; the agitation of last autumn, 464, 465 ; respective attitude of the Irish Tories and Liberals, 466 ; preface of Mr. Gladstone's policy, 467 ; its true sense, 468, 469 ; the Coercion Act and the National

Press, 470, 471 ; the military elements of an Irish insurrection considered, 472, 473 ; the policy of the new Nation, 474, 475 ; character of the present Irish Administration, 476 ; estimate of the Government Land Bill, 477, 478 ; the Education question, 479 ; Irish political prospects and problems, 480, 481.

Is the Western Church under an anathema ? *noticed*, 257.

JACQUES (F.), Du Pape et du Concile, *noticed*, 241.

JANUS AND FALSE BRETHREN : Unscientific character of Janus, 299 ; letter of Mr. Oxenham, 300 ; examination of this letter, 301-303 ; Janus's inconsistency, 304 ; Janus on the freedom of councils, 305 ; true judgment to be formed on the doctrine of Infallibility, 306, 307 ; the Church and Catholic philosophy, 308 ; the duty of submission to pastoral guidance, 309 ; the Pope's letter to the *Bien Public* of Ghent, 310, 311 ; evil of worldliness, 312.

Janus, The Pope and the Council, *reviewed*, 184-299 ; *noticed*, 246.

Jeanjacquot (F.) Explanations concerning the Co-operation of the Blessed Virgin, *noticed*, 225.

KEOGH (F.), Specimens of Scientific History from Janus, *noticed*, 249.

Knox (F.), When does the Church speak Infallibly ? *noticed*, 523.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (THE) QUESTION IN IRELAND, 165-184 : General division of the Irish people, 165 ; Mr. Campbell on landlords and labourers, 166 ; farmers and labourers, 167 ; the Irish graziers, 168 ; the landlords, 169 ; the farmers and the Fenians, 170 ; pasture or tillage 171-173 ; Mr. Campbell on small tillage farmers, 174 ; the large farmers and graziers, 175 ; tenant right in the South, 176 ; leases, 177 ; recognition of tenant right, 178 ; property in improvements, 179 ; settlement grants, 180 ; period of notice, 181 ; question of improvements, 182 ; drainage and reclamation of waste lands, 183.

Laird (James), The Irish Land Question, *reviewed*, 165.

Lawlor (Denis Shyne), Pilgrimages in the Pyrenees, *noticed*, 565.

Lindsay (Hon. Colin), Evidence for the Papacy, *noticed*, 542.

Lynch (Rev. J.), Life of S. Patrick, *noticed*, 561.

M'COMBIE (W.), The Irish Land Question, *reviewed*, 165.

MacLagan (Peter), Land-culture in Ireland, *reviewed*, 165.

M'Neel-Caird (Alexander), Mary Stuart, *reviewed*, 123.

Maret (Mgr.), Du Concile Général, *reviewed*, 184.

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS — THE CASKET PAPERS, 123-164 : Timely appearance of Mr. Hosack's volume, 123 ; the Casket Papers, 124 ; Mr. Froude's and Mr. Burton's works, 125 ; Mr. Froude's method, 126 ; Mr. M'Neel-Caird's and M. Wiesener's works, 127 ; discovery of the Casket Papers, 128 ; their first publication, 129 ; first detailed account of their contents, 130 ; the original journal of the Commission, 131 ; the letters, 132 ; the first Glasgow letter, 133 ; the second Glasgow letter, 134 ; Mary's dealings with Darnley, 135-136 ; conclusion of this letter, 137-140 ; Mr. Hosack's arrangement of the letters, 140, 141 ; the three

Stirling letters, 142, 143 ; Mr. Burton's criticism on the Sonnets, 144, 145 ; the Conference of Craigmillar, 146, 147 ; external proofs, 148 ; evidence of Paris and Bethune, 150, 151 ; Mr. Froude's acceptance of the Casket Papers, 152 ; examination of his arguments, 153-157 ; Mr. Hosack's estimate of the letters, 157, 158 ; the second Glasgow letter, 159 ; contention of Laing and Robertson, 160 ; Bothwell's divorce, 161 ; the third letter, 162 ; the fifth letter, 163 ; estimate of Mr. Hosack's book, 164.

Melia (Dr.), Origin of the Waldenses, *noticed*, 550.

MINISTERIAL (THE) EDUCATION BILL, 430-450 : Comparison of the year 1870 with the year 1820, 430 ; provisions of the new Education Bill, 431, 432 ; its reception by the public and by Catholics, 433, 434 ; object of our exertions, 435-438 ; its possible effect on denominational education, 439 ; Archbishop Whately and Mr. Senior on Irish education, 440, 441 ; amendments to be pressed, 442-446 ; the second reading carried, 446 ; the Canadian Common School system, 447 ; School Boards, 448 ; the Conscience clause, 449 ; mixed education in Ireland, 450.

MOLLOY (DOCTOR) ON GEOLOGY AND REVELATION, 403-417 : Object and matter of Doctor Molloy's book, 403, 404 ; his first chapter, 405 ; the Rock system, 406 ; general fabric of geological argument, 407 ; the process of denudation, 408 ; power of water, 409 ; glaciers and icebergs, 410 ; the groups of volcanoes, 411 ; hot springs, 412 ; earthquakes, 413 ; theological section of Dr. Molloy's work, 414 ; interpretation of Scripture, 415 ; 1st chapter of Genesis, 416 ; age of the earth, 417.

Molloy (Rev. Gerald), Geology and Revelation, *reviewed*, 403.

Month (The), *noticed*, 296.

NARY (Jacobus), De Matrimonio B. M. Virginis, *noticed*, 244.

Nepveu (F.), on the Love of Our Lord, *noticed*, 279.

Newman (J. H., D.D.), Grammar of Assent, *noticed*, 535.

New School History of England, *noticed*, 289.

ORRIDGE (B. B.), Illustrations of Jack Cade's Rebellion, *noticed*, 569.

PASSE (M.), Cantorbéry, *noticed*, 285.

Paula (S.), Sketch of, *noticed*, 560.

Pelagius (Patriarch), The English Communion Service, *noticed*, 265.

Popular Education at Home and Abroad, *reviewed*, 1 ; *noticed*, 227.

Pye (H. J.), Religion of Common Sense, *noticed*, 267.

RAMIÈRE (F.), Papal Letter to, 497.

————— Les Doctrines Romaines sur le Libéralisme, *noticed*, 535.

————— Contradictions de Mgr. Maret, *noticed*, 527.

Renouf (P. Le Page), Case of Pope Honorius, *reviewed*, 372.

Renouf (P.L.), Case of Honorius reconsidered, *noticed*, 250.

RENOUF'S (MR.) REPLY ON POPE HONORIUS, 372-402 : General character of Mr. Renouf's reply, 372 ; the Monothelite doctrine, 373 ; Christ's faculty of willing, 374, 375 ; Suarez on the Divine humanity, 376 ;

